DO YOU KNOW

What manuscripts survive to form bases for modern translations of the Bible ?

When and how the various books were canonized ?

The traditional account of the Septuagint ?

How the Protestant and Catholic Bibles differ ?

Who first paraphrased the Vulgate in English ?

Who first translated the Bible into English ?

"Where Did We Get Our Bible?" answers the questions of children, the doubts of adults, and refreshes the memories of busy minds.

Where did we get our Bible?

by THE REV. GEORGE L. ROBINSON
PH. D., D. D., LL. D.

Professor of Biblical Literature and English Bible, Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Chicago, (McCormick)

A DOUBLEDAY DORAN RELIGIOUS BOOK

Price

net, $2.00

THE STORY OF OUR BIBLE

The Story of Our Bible is second in interest and inspiration only to the Bible Story itself. Nothing pleases a young mind more than the account of origins. To the elder the stirring vitality of the Bible brings a quickening message.

When Dr. Robinson wrote "The Twelve Minor Prophets" he revealed the depth, breadth and wisdom of his scholarship. Adopted widely as text and reference, the book sprang into great popularity which it has enjoyed since publicacion.

Accessible, clear and faith-sustaining information and teaching material of great value for the preacher, the teacher and the parent are in Dr. Robinson's new book.

WHERE DID WE GET OUR BIBLE?

WHERE DID WE GET OUR BIBLE?

BY

REV. GEORGE L. ROBINSON, PH.D., D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND ENGLISH BIBLE IN PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF CHICAGO

GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK
DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.
1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY DOUBLEDAY, DORAN
& COMPANY, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES AT THE
COUNTRY LIFE PRESS, GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

FIRST EDITION

To

My Good Brother

CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON

PREFACE

The history of how we got our Bible is a purely historical question, having nothing whatever to do with one's orthodoxy or faith. So long as the recorder sticks to the facts of history he is a safe guide; when he departs from these he is sure to lose his way and mislead others.

To the Mohammedan the Koran is the Word of God, "eternal and uncreated," the original text of which is in heaven. God, he claims, "sent down" (*i.e.,* revealed) his secrets to the Prophet of Mecca; not all at once, however, but piecemeal and gradually. The result is that Mahomet bequeathed to his followers a book but little smaller in compass than our New Testament, and which, they think, is read by over two hundred million people throughout the world.

To the Christian, on the other hand, the Bible is God's Word, a Divine Library indeed of sacred books, which also was entrusted to earthen vessels "in many distinct messages and by various methods;" the whole process requiring some fifteen centuries for its accomplishment.

The Bible is unique in that it is an international book. It has clearly demonstrated its vitality through

its many translations into other languages. Homer's *Iliad,* which is sometimes called "the Bible of the Athenians," has been translated, it is reported, into some twenty different tongues; but only for students of literature, not to win new worshippers of the gods of Olympus. Shakespeare's *Dramas* have been rendered into thirty-three languages; Bunyan's sacred allegory, the *Pilgrim's Progress,* into one hundred and eleven languages and dialects; while the whole Bible, both Old Testament and New, has been translated into one hundred and thirty-seven languages, and the complete New Testament into one hundred and thirty-eight more. Strange that Scotland never produced a translation of the Bible of its own until James Moffatt's in 1924!

Our attempt in this brief Handbook has been threefold: (1) to explain why we have in our Protestant Bible just sixty-six books; (2) to show which are the oldest manuscripts extant; and especially (3) to tell the story of our own English Version. The author hopes, inasmuch as his classroom lectures on how we got our Bible have finally been committed to type, that they may become helpful to a wider circle, and perhaps assist his former students in stimulating other peoples' interest in this very important theme.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
Preface		vii
I	The Word "Canon"	1
II	The Tripartite Division of the Old Testament	8
III	The So-called "Larger" and "Smaller" Canons	12
IV	An Examination of the Witnesses	19
V	The Old Testament in the Christian Church	50
VI	The Apocryphal Writings Self-condemned	64
VII	The Making of the New Testament	75
VIII	The Ancient Versions	87
IX	Ancient Manuscripts Still Extant	107
X	Anglo-Saxon Beginnings	124
XI	Early English Translations	128
XII	Tyndale's Pioneer Attempt	133
XIII	Protestant Bibles in the Sixteenth Century	140
XIV	The Rheims-Douay Version	155

CHAPTER PAGE

XV The Authorized Version 164

XVI The English Revised Version 170

XVII The American Standard Revision . . . 176

XVIII Footnotes and Marginal References . . . 185

Appendix:

Chronological Table 197

Selected Literature 199

WHERE DID WE GET OUR BIBLE?

I

THE WORD "CANON"

1. The word "Canon" is of Christian origin, from the Greek word *kanon,* which in turn was probably borrowed from the Hebrew word *kane,* meaning a reed or measuring rod, hence norm or rule. Later it came to mean a rule of faith, and eventually a catalogue or list. In present usage it signifies a collection of religious writings Divinely inspired, and hence authoritative, normative, sacred, and binding. The term occurs in Gal. 6:16; 2 Cor. 10:13-16; but it was first employed of the books of scripture, in the technical sense of a standard collection or body of sacred writings, by the Church Fathers of the fourth century; for example, in the 59th canon of the Council of Laodicea (363 A.D.)[1];

[1] Which declared, that "private psalms should not be read in the churches nor uncanonized books, but only the canonical of the New and Old Testaments."

in the Festal Epistle of Athanasius (367 A.D.)[2]; and by Amphilochius, archbishop of Iconium (395 A.D.).

2. The corresponding Hebrew expression (not used, however, in the Old Testament but in post-biblical times) according to the Talmud, was the phrase, "defile the hands." That is, writings which were suitable to be read in the synagogue were designated as books which "defile the hands." This phrase is something of an enigma! How the ancient Hebrews expressed the conception of canonicity is not known; but it is safe to say that the idea, as an idea, existed long before there was any special phrase invented to express it. In the New Testament, the word "scriptures," referring to the Old Testament writings, conveys unquestionably the notion of sacredness (Matt. 21:42; John 5:39; Acts 18:24). But the Jews, from the first century A.D. and following, employed the peculiar oriental expression, "defile the hands." What it signified to them no one to-day definitely knows. Probably, however, Lev. 16:24 gives a hint of the true interpretation. According to this passage the high priest on the Great Day of Atonement washed not only when he put on the holy garments of his office, but also when he put them off. Quite possibly, therefore, the expression "defile the hands" signified that the hands

[2] In which he says: "I thought it well . . . to put down in order the canonized books of which we not only have learned from tradition but also believe that they are divine."

which had touched the sacred writings must first be washed before touching aught else. If so, the idea expressed was one akin to that of *tabu,* practiced in the Orient. That is to say, just as certain garments worn by worshippers in encircling the secred Kaaba at Mecca are *tabu* to the Mohammedans of to-day, *i.e.,* can not be worn outside the Mosque, but must be left at the door as the worshippers quit the sanctuary, so the Hebrew writings which were fit to be read in the synagogue, rendered the hands of those who touched them *tabu,* defiling them in the sense that they must first be washed before engaging in any secular business. This seems to be the best explanation of this enigmatical phrase. Various other somewhat fanciful explanations of it, however, have been given: for example, to prevent profane uses of wornout synagogue rolls (Buhl); or, to prevent placing consecrated grain alongside of the sacred rolls in the synagogues that it might become holy, as the grain would attract mice, and the mice would gnaw the rolls (Strack and Wildeboer); or, to prevent the sacred, worn-out parchments from being used as coverings for animals (Graetz); or, to "declare the hands to be unclean unless previously washed" (Fürst and Green). But no one of these explanations quite satisfies. The idea of *tabu* is more probably imbedded in the phrase.[3]

[3] The rabbins invented the term *genuzim,* meaning "hidden away," to designate rolls that were worn out or disputed. Cemeteries filled with Hebrew manuscripts which have long been

3. The question as to who had the right to declare a writing canonical is also a disputed one. Some have maintained that the several Books of the Bible were composed by Divinely inspired authors who were conscious not only of their inspiration, but also that their writings were destined to be handed down to the Church of future generations as sacred. In other words, each writer canonized, as it were, his own writings, and each writing was consequently accepted as the Word of God immediately upon its appearance. This was the view of Green and Davis at Princeton. For example, Green says: "No formal declaration of their canonicity was needed to give them sanction. They were from the first not only eagerly read by the devout but believed to be Divinely obligatory . . . Each individual book of an acknowledged prophet of Jehovah, or of any one accredited as inspired by Him to make known His will, was accepted as the word of God immediately upon its appearance . . . Those books and those only were accepted as the Divine standards of their faith and regulative of their conduct, which were written for this definite purpose by those whom

---

buried are frequently found to-day in Egypt in connection with Jewish synagogues. Such rolls might first be placed in the *genizah* or rubbish chamber of the sanctuary. They are not to be confounded with uncanonical or apocryphal writings. For such the Jews had a special term, "books that are outside." They could not be read in the synagogues. "Hidden books" were rather worn-out parchments, or canonical rolls which might by some be temporarily disputed.

they believed to be inspired of God. It was this which made them canonical. The spiritual profit found in them corresponded with and confirmed the belief in their heavenly origin. And the public official action which further attested, though it did not initiate, their canonicity, followed in the wake of the popular recognition of their Divine authority . . . The writings of the prophets, delivered to the people as a declaration of the Divine will, possessed canonical authority from the moment of their appearance . . . The canon does not derive its authority from the church, whether Jewish or Christian; the office of the church is merely that of a custodian and a witness." [4]

On the contrary, as Dillmann long ago pointed out, "History knows nothing of the individual books having been designed to be sacred from their origin. These books bore indeed in themselves from the first those characteristics on account of which they were subsequently admitted into the sacred collection, but yet always had first to pass through a shorter or longer period of verification, and make trial of the Divine power resident within them upon the hearts of the church before they were outwardly and formally acknowledged by it as Divine books." [5] Very probably two parties were ever involved in the

---

[4] W. H. Green, *General Introduction to the Old Testament; The Canon,* pp. 35f, 106, 110; cf. J. D. Davis, *Pres. and Reformed Review,* April, 1902, p. 182.

[5] A. Dillmann, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie, III,* p. 420.

making of canonical scripture—the original authors and the Church—both of whom were inspired by the same Spirit. For, so far as is known, the great majority of the writers of Holy Scripture did not deliberately hand over their productions to the Church and expect them to be received as canonical. Rather the authors wrote inspired by the Divine Spirit, and the Church, then and ever since, Jewish and Christian alike, has been inspired to recognize the authoritative character of their individual writings. And so it will be to the end of time. The Scriptures are still on trial, and ever should be.

And what is true of the Old Testament is equally true of the New. The early Christians used the Old Testament for a whole century or more before they ventured to give the New Testament writings equal rank. Only after the New Testament had been read in Christian churches as interpretations of the Old, did the Fathers give them a rank equal to the Hebrew Scriptures. "We cannot in fact be certain that anything comes from God unless it bring us personally something evidently Divine." [6]

Other religions have their sacred books: for example four *Vedas* of Brahmanism; the *Kanjur,* containing the canon of the Buddhists; the *Book of the Dead,* called the canon of the Egyptians; the *Sibylline Oracles* of ancient Rome; the *Avesta* of the Persians; and the *Koran* of Mohammedanism. Ac-

[6] C. A. Briggs, *The Study of Holy Scripture,* p. 162.

cording to the Talmud, the Law of Moses was created nine hundred and seventy-four generations before the creation of the world, or a thousand generations before Moses!

II

THE TRIPARTITE DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

The ancient Jews classified the writings of the Old Testament under three heads: (1) The *Torah,* or Law; (2) The *Nebhiim,* or Prophets; and (3) the *Kethubhim,* or writings, in Greek the *Hagiographa.*

The *Torah,* meaning etymologically "Direction," included the five books of the Pentateuch (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy).

The *Nebhiim* embraced both (a) the four so-called Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel treated as one book, and 1 and 2 Kings also counted as one book); and (b) the four so-called Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets counted as one book); a total of eight books.

The *Kethubhim,* or Writings, were eleven in all, including Psalms, Proverbs and Job, the five *Megilloth,* or Rolls (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah counted as one book, and 1 and 2 Chronicles also reckoned as one book.

In all there are twenty-four books, identically the same as those of the Protestant Canon to-day. This was the original count of the Jews as far back as we can trace any canon among them at all. Later, certain Jewish authorities appended Ruth to the book of Judges, and Lamentations to the book of Jeremiah, and thereby obtained the number twenty-two, corresponding to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet; but this latter manner of counting was unusual and somewhat fanciful. Still later others divided Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Jeremiah-Lamentations into two books each, respectively, and thereby obtained twenty-seven, the difference, five, being fancifully regarded as corresponding to the five letters of the Hebrew alphabet which have a peculiar final form when standing at the end of a word. Jerome states that "twenty-two" is the correct reckoning, but he adds, "Some count both Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa, and so get twenty-four." Fourth Esdras which is the oldest (85-96 A.D.) witness to the number of books in the Old Testament, gives "twenty-four."

How to account for this tripartite division of the Old Testament books involves the most careful investigation of the whole process by which the canon actually took shape. If the entire canon of the Old Testament were formed, as some allege, by one man, or by one set of men, in a single age, then it is obvious that the books must have been

separated into these three groups on the basis of certain material differences, real or imaginary, in their contents. If, on the other hand, the process of canonization was gradual and extended over several generations, as seems to be the case, then the various books were separated from one another and classified partly at least because one section of the canon was absolutely closed before certain other books of similar character were written. In either case, it is difficult to explain why the books of Kings and the books of Chronicles are not grouped together in the same division, and it is likewise strange, indeed, very strange, why the book of Daniel does not stand among the "Prophets"!

To explain Daniel's position among the *Kethubhim* instead of among the *Nebhiim,* medieval Jews were wont to say that "the Prophets were inspired by the spirit of prophecy, whereas the Writings by the Holy Spirit"; which implies different degrees of inspiration. But this is plainly a distinction without a difference, the spirit of prophecy and the Holy Spirit being one and the same. Certain Protestants in modern times have attempted to explain the mystery by distinguishing between the *donum propheticum* and the *munus propheticum, i.e.,* between the gift and the office of prophecy. They allow that Daniel possessed the gift of prophecy, but they deny that he was Divinely appointed to the office of prophet. On the other hand, Matt. 24:15 speaks of "Daniel the prophet," and Amos resents being con-

sidered a prophet (Amos 7:14). Oehler modifies this explanation, by trying to show that the threefold division of the canon corresponds to the three stages of Israel's religious development, namely, Mosaism, Prophetism, and Hebraism, Oehler's theory being, that the Law was the foundation of the entire canon. From it there evolved two lines of development, one objective, the Prophets, the other subjective, the Writings. But this does not satisfactorily account for Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles being in the third division; for in what sense can they be said to be more subjective than the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings?

The Septuagint version, whose date is about 250-150 B.C., takes no notice of the tripartite division. The true solution, accordingly, probably is, that the process of canonization was gradual. When all the evidence is finally examined, it will probably be discovered that "the Law" was canonized chronologically first, "the Prophets" considerably later, and "the Writings" last of all. It may even become evident that the two last divisions of the canon were collected and canonized synchronously, and hence that the tripartite divisions of the canon are due to material differences in their contents as well as to chronology.

III

THE SO-CALLED "LARGER" AND "SMALLER" CANONS

Between the New Testament of Roman Catholics and that of Protestants there is absolutely no difference as to number, or size, of the books in the canon; the number and the order of the various twenty-seven canonical writings correspond exactly. But the case of the Old Testament is different: Catholics holding to what is sometimes spoken of as the "larger" canon of the Jews in Alexandria, while Protestants hold to the "smaller" canon of the Jews in Palestine. The actual difference between the Old Testaments of these two great divisions of the Christian Church is a matter of seven complete books, and portions of two others, namely, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, First and Second Maccabees, together with certain additions to Esther and to Daniel.[1] All these Protestants

[1] Viz, to Esther, chaps. 10:4-16:24 of the Greek and Latin Versions; and to Daniel, "The Song of the Three Holy Children," consisting of 68 verses, which is inserted by the Septuagint between verses 23 and 24 of chapter 3; "The History of Susanna," numbered in the Latin Vulgate as Chapter 13, with 64 verses; and "The History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon," numbered as chapter 14, with 42 verses.

rightfully reject as apocryphal, because there is no evidence whatever that they were ever considered as canonical by the Jews.

The chief witness to the existence of a possible "larger" canon in Alexandria is the Greek Version of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint, dating probably from between 250 and 150 B.C. But it is exceedingly doubtful whether the pre-Christian Jews in Egypt ever had an independent and larger canon than that of their brethren in Palestine. There is absolutely no explicit witness to this effect. The Septuagint Version is inconclusive, for this reason: all the extant manuscripts of the Septuagint are much later than the translation itself, and in every case they are of Christian origin. The mere fact that the existing manuscripts of this ancient version contain the apocryphal books, is a long way from proving that the original translation contained them. These apocryphal books may easily have crept in during the five hundred years between the actual translation (ca. 150 B.C.) and the date of the earliest manuscripts extant (ca. 350 A.D.), through scribal transmission, at the hand of Christians. And not only are all the extant Greek manuscripts of Christian origin, they differ widely among themselves as to the number of books in the Old Testament, no one of them including exactly the same books as those considered canonical to-day by the Church of Rome.

For example, the great *Vatican* MS., which is

probably "the truest representative which remains of the Alexandrian Bible," contains no books of Maccabees whatever, but does include First Esdras, which Catholics generally treat as apocryphal. On the other hand, the *Alexandrian* MS., another of the great manuscripts of the Septuagint, contains not only the extra-canonical book of First Esdras, but Third and Fourth Maccabees, and in the New Testament, the First and Second Epistles of Clement, none of which is considered canonical by Rome. Likewise, the great *Sinaitic* MS., which is hardly less important than the *Vatican* as a witness to the Septuagint, omits Baruch (which Catholics regard as canonical), but includes Fourth Maccabees, and in the New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, all of which are excluded from the Canon of Holy Scripture by Roman Catholics. In still other ancient Greek MSS., Third Maccabees, Third Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasseh are occasionally included.

Philo, himself an Alexandrian, who lived and wrote between 20 B.C. and 50 A.D., and who therefore must have been well acquainted with Jewish writings, canonical and apocryphal, never quotes from the latter. Coming down to the second century A.D., the adoption by the Alexandrian Jews of Aquila's Greek Version of the Old Testament, which omits all of the apocryphal books; and the many statements of Origen, who was for some time a resident in Egypt and who held to the strict canon,

are convincing corroborations of the statement made above, namely, that it is exceedingly doubtful whether the Jews in Egypt ever had a larger canon than their brethren in Palestine.[2]

The canon of the Jews in Palestine was, as almost everyone admits, the same as the strict canon of the Protestant Church.[3] Among the witnesses is Fourth Esdras, which though of fabulous character in many parts, nevertheless incidentally testifies to the number of books at that time reckoned as canonical in Palestine; Josephus, the Jewish historian, writing in Rome about 100 A.D., also gives the number of sacred books. In Fourth Esdras the number given is twenty-four; by Josephus, twenty-two.[4] The apparent discrepancy between them is easily accounted for by the fact that sometimes Ruth was added to Judges, and Lamentations to Jeremiah; by others they were reckoned separately. Hence the counts twenty-four and twenty-two corresponded exactly. And because the other books, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and all of the Twelve Minor Prophets, were counted as one book each, respectively, the total number of

---

[2] Cf. Wescott, *The Bible in the Church,* pp. 30ff; Buhl, *The Canon and Text,* p. 22.

[3] Cf. Kaulen, editor of the Catholic Encyclopedia, *Kirchenlexikon,* II, Cols. 1817ff; R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* 2. edit., p. 151.

[4] Fourth Esdras 14:20 (written not earlier than 50 A.D.): Josephus, *Contra Apionem,* I, 8.

the Jewish Canon in Palestine, whether twenty-two or twenty-four, coincided absolutely with our thirty-nine books.

Josephus is especially an invaluable witness to the strict canon in Palestine, inasmuch as he probably expresses not only his own view, but the traditional opinion of his people. The apocryphal books cannot possibly have been reckoned by him as included in the number, for he shows no acquaintance with them; besides, the books of Maccabees and other of the Apocryphal writings, now included in the Roman Catholic canon, would necessarily be excluded by the chronological limit which Josephus sets for the final completion of the Old Testament canon, namely, the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, about 425 B.C.

Hence we are forced to conclude that at the close of the first century A. D., the Jewish canon in Palestine was in extent the same as now accepted by Protestants. In other words, the Protestants went back to the strict canon of the ancient Jews in Jesus' time for their Old Testament. Later Jewish doubts, expressed in the Talmud, as to the canonicity of Ezekiel, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, do not vitiate the force of this statement, but rather show only how the Jews, like later Christians, deflected from the original canon of the Church.

The canon of Christ and his Apostles must, of course, beyond all doubt or question be accepted

by us as the true one. The only question that must be answered, therefore, is this: Did not Christ and his Apostles sanction the "larger," or Alexandrian, canon, of the modern Roman Church? It is argued that because the writers of the New Testament quote repeatedly from the Greek or Septuagint Version of Alexandria instead of from the original Hebrew, therefore the Bible of Jesus was the Septuagint. Indeed, it is estimated that six out of seven of all the quotations made from the Old Testament in the New are from this version. Does this not argue, therefore, in favour of the "larger" canon? It certainly would were it not for two considerations: (1) they never quote from the apocryphal books, though they do show acquaintance with them and use them without in any sense approving of them. Even Gigot, a celebrated Catholic, concedes that, "this distinct approval of the entire Greek Bible has left no trace in history, and that the variety of opinions which soon arose regarding the extent of the canon, tends to show that such an approval was never given."[5] On the other hand, they also quote from non-canonical sources, such as the "Book of Enoch," which neither Catholics nor Protestants ever consider canonical; hence, if usage is to be the guide, the Book of Enoch ought to be canonized too.[6] Nor can it be justly said, with Gigot,

[5] *General Introduction,* p. 42.

[6] Cf. Jude 14, 15, which is a composite quotation from the Book of Enoch, chaps. 1:9; 5:4; 27:2; cf. 60:8; 18:15.

that "if the Apostles looked upon the deutero-canonical writings as non-inspired, it was their plain duty not only to abstain from giving them full approval, but also to exclude them from the Bible used by the early Christian." For this assumes unwarrantably two things: (1) That it was the duty of Christ and the Apostles to settle the question of the Old Testament canon, which they did not do in any sense; and (2) that at that early time the "rolls" of scripture were already bound together in one volume, or written together on a single parchment, which was not the case.[7]

There is, therefore, really no positive evidence anywhere that Christ, or his apostles, regarded the apocryphal, or deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament, as an integral portion of God's holy revelation. On the contrary, being Jews and residents of Palestine, there is every reason to believe that they held to the strict Jewish, or Protestant, canon.[8]

[7] "The change from rolls to leaf-books was made," according to Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament,* p. 333, "about the year 300 A.D."

[8] Stapleton, a noted Catholic authority, is quoted by Green, *The Canon,* p. 157n. as conceding that "Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and other books of the Old Testament were not confirmed in the time of the Apostles."

IV

AN EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES

1. *The Witness of the Old Testament to Itself.*

In order to determine the exact number of books in the Old Testament, it becomes necessary to examine the witnesses, which, with greater or lesser definiteness, tell how the Divine Library came together. Of these witnesses there are twelve of special importance, which are now to be examined chronologically. We begin with the oldest:

Though the Old Testament does not tell us anything about the processes of its own *canonization,* it does furnish valuable hints as to how the ancient Hebrews *preserved* their most sacred writings. Thus in Exodus 40:20 it is stated that the "testimony," by which is meant the two tables of the Law containing the Ten Commandments, was put into the Ark of the Covenant for safe-keeping; doubtless because it was considered as coming from God and therefore sacrosanct. In Deuteronomy 31:9, 24-26, the laws of the Deuteronomic Code are said to have been delivered to the sons of Levi, and by them deposited "by the side of the Ark," that they might be there for a witness and a testimony against Israel. Such language indisputably conveys the impression that the laws contained in the book of Deuteronomy

were regarded, even from that early time, as a standard of faith and action.[1]

According to 1 Kings 8:9, when Solomon brought the Ark up from the city of David to the Temple, the two tables of the Law, on which were written the Ten Commandments, were its *only* contents, being still most carefully preserved. According to 2 Kings 11:12, when Joash was crowned king, Jehoiada, the high priest, is said to have given him "the testimony." This contained, according to Ryle, in all probability "the substance of the fundamental laws of the covenant," and was regarded as "the fundamental charter of the constitution." Whether such a charter was limited to the Ten Commandments, or whether it contained other laws that are now embodied in the Pentateuch, we cannot, of course, do more than conjecture.[2] In Prov. 25:1, it is stated that many of the maxims contained in the Book of Proverbs were copied out by Hezekiah's men.

Now, all these passages witness to the preservation of certain portions of the Old Testament—particularly of the Torah. But *preservation* is not exactly synonymous with *canonization*. A writing might well be carefully preserved without

---

[1] Cf. Driver, *Comm. on Deut.*, pp. 80, 81, 343, who says, "The idea of a 'testimony' here in the book of Deuteronomy is that of an *attestation,* or witness, or solemn declaration of God's will, and is used as a general designation of moral and religious ordinances, conceived as a Divinely instituted standard of conduct."

[2] Cf. Ryle, *Canon of the Old Test.*, pp. 45, 46.

becoming canonized as a standard of faith and conduct. Nevertheless the two ideas are closely related; for, when religious writings are sedulously preserved, it may be presumed that their intrinsic value was regarded as correspondingly precious.

There are other passages which confirm this view. The first is that contained in 2 Kings 22:8ff., describing the finding of the "Book of the Law" by Hilkiah; and how Josiah, the King, instituted, on the basis of it, a religious reformation, and bound the people to obey its precepts.

Here is a clear instance of how the Law, or at least some portion of it (how much no one can say), was regarded as of normative and authoritative character. Immediately upon its discovery both the king and his councillors recognize that it was not only an ancient law code, but that it contained the commandments of Jehovah God (2 Kings 22:13, 18, 19). Its authority was absolutely undisputed. Yet, nothing is said in the account of its formal "canonicity," or whether it would "defile the hands"! Consequently we can hardly speak of it, as is sometimes done, as "the beginnings of the Canon"; for, in a similar historic sense the beginnings of the canon are to be found in Exod. 24:7.

Another passage, also of more than ordinary importance is Neh. 8:8ff., according to which Ezra is said to have "read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly; and they gave the sense . . . and the people wept when they heard the words of the law."

This passage seems to imply, beyond question, that in Ezra's time (444 B. C.), the Law, *i.e.*, the Pentateuch, was already regarded as authoritative and canonical; or, as we would say, as "holy scripture." Yet, there is no explicit statement in it to this effect!

This is practically everything the Old Testament has to say about itself, though other passages such as Zech. 7:12 and Dan. 9:2 might be cited to show the deep regard which later prophets had for the writings of their predecessors.[3] The witness of the Old Testament to itself, accordingly, is incomplete, and correspondingly negative. The New Testament, as a witness to itself, furnishes no parallels to these of the Old Testament to itself.

2. *The Samaritan Pentateuch* (*ca.* 432 *B.C.*).

Chronologically the Old Testament is of course our most ancient witness; it brings us down to 444 B.C. The next in order is the Samaritan Pentateuch, the history of which is as follows: About 432 B.C., as we know from Neh. 13:28 and Josephus[4], Nehemiah expelled from the Jewish colony in Jerusalem Manasseh, the polygamous grandson of Eliashib the high priest, and son-in-law of Sanbal-

[3] Zech. 7:12 is regarded as the *locus classicus* of the Old Testament, teaching the inspiration of the Prophets; as 2 Tim. 3:16 is a witness to the inspiration of the Old Testament in general.

[4] *Antiquities*, xi, 7, 2-8, 4.

lat. Thereupon, Manasseh founded the schismatic community of the Samaritans, and instituted on Mount Gerizim a rival worship to that of the temple at Jerusalem.[5] Of the Samaritans there still survive to-day some 140 souls; they reside exclusively in Shechem and are known as "the smallest religious sect in the world." It is true that Josephus, speaking of this event, confuses chronology somewhat, making Nehemiah (ca. 432 B.C.) and Alexander the Great (ca. 330 B.C.) contemporaries, whereas a full century separated them, but the time element, for our purpose, is of little moment.

The bearing of the whole matter upon the history of the formation of the Canon is this: the Samaritans possess the Pentateuch only. They have never had any larger Bible; hence it is inferred by many that at the time of Manasseh's expulsion, the Jewish canon included the Pentateuch and the Pentateuch only. Otherwise, Manasseh, escaping out of Nehemiah's hand, would have taken with him the other books already included in the Jewish canon. For example, Budde writes: "If alongside of the Law there had been other *sacred* writings, it would be inexplicable why these last also did not pass into currency with the Samaritans." [6] Such a

---

[5] According to Josephus, Manasseh married Nicaso the daughter of Sanballat, whom Darius the last king of Persia sent into Samaria, thinking that by this union friendly relations would be cemented between the Persians and the Jews.

[6] *Encyc. Biblica,* Art. "Canon," col. 659.

conclusion, however, is unwarranted, because it is based upon the argument from silence. There were patent reasons, on the other hand, why the Samaritans should have rejected the "Prophets" and the "Writings," even had they already been canonized. The Prophets and the Psalms exalted Zion. The Samaritans, who erected a temple on the rival heights of Mount Gerizim, would hardly adopt into their canon books that glorified the temple at Jerusalem. It cannot, accordingly, be safely inferred from the fact that the Samaritans accept of the Pentateuch only, that therefore the Pentateuch was alone canonical, or "defiled the hands"! The *argumentum e silentio* in this case borders on presumption.

3. *The Septuagint Version* (*ca.* 250-150 *B.C.*).

The Septuagint (LXX) version in Greek is the first translation of the Old Testament ever made; indeed, the Old Testament is the first book of any note in all the world's literature to receive the honour of being translated into another tongue. This fact in itself is indicative of the esteem in which it was held at the time. The work of translating it was inaugurated by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.), and probably continued for well nigh a century (ca. 250-150 A.D.). Aristeas, a distinguished officer of Ptolemy, records how it came about.[7]

[7] See Chapter VIII.

The lack of unity of plan in the books of the second and third divisions of the canon indicates that probably many different hands at different times were engaged in the task. In fact, there is a subscription at the close of the translation of the book of Esther which states that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy, translated it in Jerusalem. But the whole was apparently completed before Jesus ben Sirach, the younger, wrote his Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (ca. 132 B.C.).

Now the Septuagint Version, which was the Bible of our Lord and his apostles, is supposed by some to have included, in its original form, many of the so-called apocryphal books. Furthermore, in our present LXX text, the canonical and apocryphal books stand intermingled in such an order as to show that the translators knew nothing of the tripartite division of the Old Testament, or, if they did they quite ignored it. The order of the books of our English Old Testament is of course derived from the LXX which has come down to us through the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome.

On the basis of the LXX, as we saw in Chapter III, Catholics advocate what is known as the "larger" canon of the Jews in Alexandria. Protestants reject the idea because there is no evidence whatever that the canon of the Jews in Alexandria was different, or varied, from that of the Jews in Palestine. The fact that all the most ancient manuscripts—the *Vatican,* the *Sinaitic,* and the *Alex-*

andrian—contain many of the so-called Apocryphal books is no proof, for the reason that all the extant MSS. of the LXX are of Christian, not Jewish, origin. Moreover, as we saw above, these great MSS. do not contain the same Apocryphal books: for example, the *Vatican* MS. contains no book of Maccabees whatever, while the *Codex Alexandrinus* contains even 3rd and 4th Maccabees; and the *Sinaitic* MS. departs still more widely from the Canon of Roman Catholics. The value of the evidence derived from the LXX, accordingly, is largely negative. It only indicates that when the translation of the Old Testament into Greek was being made in Alexandria, the process of canonization was still incomplete. For had it been actually finished, it is reasonable to suppose that the work of translation would have proceeded according to some well-defined plan, and would have been executed with greater self-consistency and also accuracy. As it is, the translators took all sorts of liberties with the text, adding whole chapters to the books of Esther and Daniel, and omitting fully one eighth of the text of Jeremiah. Work of such a character indicates clearly that the translators were not executing a public or ecclesiastical trust, but rather were interested in a private enterprise. Our necessary conclusion, therefore, is that the work of canonization was not complete while the work of translation was in progress in Alexandria.

4. *Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach (ca. 170 B.C.).*

Our next witness is Jesus ben Sirach, who (ca. 170 B. C.) wrote a somewhat formidable book entitled Ecclesiasticus, also known as the Wisdom of ben Sirach. The author lived in Jerusalem and wrote in Hebrew. His maxims of Wisdom resemble those of the book of Proverbs; some of them approach in ethical value the high level of the Gospel. And because of this, the book of Ecclesiasticus is usually regarded as the most important of all the apocryphal books. Theologically it is the chief monument of primitive Sadduceeism.

In chapters 44-50, the author sings a "hymn to the Fathers," eulogizing the mighty heroes of Israel from Enoch to Nehemiah, in fact from Adam to Simon, including the most famous men described in the Old Testament, and making explicit mention of the Twelve Prophets. These facts indicate that the whole, or, at least, the most of the Old Testament was known to him, and that already in his day (ca. 170 B.C.) the so-called Minor Prophets were regarded as a special group of writings by themselves.

What the value of Ecclesiasticus is as a witness to the size of the canonical Old Testament in 170 B.C., however, depends upon the interpretation one places on the passage in 24:33, which reads, "I will yet pour out doctrine as prophecy and leave it unto

generations of ages." From such language it is natural to infer that he feels himself inspired and capable of adding to the other Hebrew writings already in existence, and that, though he knew the full prophetic canon, he did not draw any very definite line of demarcation between his own work and the inspired writings of the prophets. For example, he passes over from the patriarchs and prophets of Israel to Simon the son of Onias, who was probably Simon the high priest in his own time, making no distinction between them. This may have been due partly to personal conceit, as again in 39:12 he says, "Yet more will I utter, which I have thought upon; and I am filled as the moon at the full"; yet, more probably, in his day still, only the Law and the Prophets were actually set apart and canonized in the strict sense, while at the same time alongside of these sacred books a body of literature was being gathered and gradually augmented, of a nature not absolutely foreign to his own writings, and therefore not clearly marked off from literary compositions like his own. To Jesus ben Sirach the Law was everything, for he identifies it with the highest wisdom; indeed, all wisdom in his judgment is derived from a study of the Law (cf. 19:20-24; 15: 1-18; 24:23; 2:16; 39:1).

5. *The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus* (*ca.* 132 *B.C.*).

The Prologue or Preface to the book of Ecclesiasticus is our next witness to the formation of the

Old Testament canon. It was written by the grandson of Jesus ben Sirach, who bore his grandfather's name (ca. 132 B. C.). Jesus ben Sirach the younger translated in Egypt his grandfather's proverbs of Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus into Greek, and added to them a Prologue or Preface of his own. In this Prologue he thrice refers to the tripartite division of the Old Testament. This is the very first witness we have to the threefold division of the Old Testament books. He says: "Whereas many and great things have been delivered unto us by the Law and the Prophets, and *other books of our Fathers,* and had gotten therein good judgment (having gained great familiarity therein—R. V.), he was drawn on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom. . . . For the same things uttered in Hebrew and translated into another tongue, have not the same force in them; and not only these things, but the Law itself, and the Prophets, and *the rest of the books,* have no small difference, when they are spoken in their own language."

These are explicit and definite allusions to the threefold division of the Old Testament writings; yet, the technical titles of only the first and second divisions are really employed; the third is vague, because of his fluctuating use of the terms, "the other books of the Fathers," and "the rest of the books." These phrases may, or may not, refer to the *Kethubhim.* However, he evidently refers to writings with solid religious contents, such as the Jews

finally came to incorporate among the *Kethubhim,* or Writings, of the third division. By "the other books of our Fathers," he can hardly be supposed to have meant an indefinite collection without any limitations or number, though he fails to tell us which or how many they are. From his further statement that his grandfather, having immersed himself in the Law and the Prophets, and other books of the Fathers, felt drawn on also himself to write something for the profit of others, it may justifiably be inferred that in his day there was as yet no very definite gulf fixed between canonical writings and those of other men, and that the sifting process was still going on.[8]

6. 1 *and* 2 *Maccabees* (*ca.* 125-70 *B.C.*).

First Maccabees was written originally in Hebrew; 2 Maccabees, in Greek; their dates falling probably somewhere between 125 and 70 B.C.[9] The value of these books as a witness to the history of the Old Testament Canon centres about his allusions to the book of Daniel, and to the book of Psalms. In 1 Macc. 1:54 he tells how Antiochus Epiphanes "set up the abomination of desolation"

[8] Cf. W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* pp. 178-179.

[9] The author of 1 Macc. is acquainted, on the one hand, with the deeds of John Hyrcanus, who flourished between 135 and 105 B.C., and apparently knows nothing, on the other hand, of the conquest of Palestine by Pompey in 63 B.C.

upon the altar at Jerusalem, referring most likely to Dan. 9:24-27; and in 1 Macc. 2:59, 60, he speaks of Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, who by believing were saved from the fiery furnace, and of Daniel, who was delivered from the mouths of the lions (Dan. 1:7; 2:26: 6:23). From these citations and allusions it is obvious that the book of Daniel was already at that time regarded as of superior, if not normative and canonical, character. This is indirectly confirmed by 1 Macc. 7:16, 17, which introduces a quotation from Ps. 79:2 with the solemn formula, "According to the words which he wrote." Such language suggests that this Psalm also was already revered, if not canonical.

The book of 2 Maccabees, which was written probably about 124 B.C., also contains a couple of passages of considerable importance in their bearing upon the question before us. Both, however, are found in a spurious letter purporting to have been sent by the inhabitants of Judaea to their fellow-countrymen residing in Egypt. The first passage, in 2 Macc. 2:13 tells how Nehemiah, when "founding a library, gathered together the acts of the Kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the Epistles of the Kings concerning holy gifts." While these words throw no special light upon the formation of the canon, they do connect with the name of Nehemiah the preservation of public documents and historical records of national interest, and how he, as a lover of books, founded a library. This is in perfect agree-

ment with what we know of Nehemiah's character, for he compiled the genealogy of Neh. 7; besides, *collection* precedes *selection*. The other passage in 2 Macc. 2:14 reads: "In like manner also Judas gathered together all things that were lost by reason of the war we had, and they remain with us." Though these words are found in a letter, supposed to be spurious, there is every reason for believing them to be the statement of a fact. For, when Antiochus, the arch enemy of the nation, sought to stamp out the religion of the Jews by destroying their books (cf. 1 Macc. 1:56, 57), what would have been more natural and self-consistent for a true patriot like Judas than to attempt to re-collect their sacred writings? "This statement, therefore," as Wildeboer observes, "may well be worthy of credence." [10]

These books of the Maccabees, accordingly, though they yield nothing definite as to the exact number of the books recovered and collected, do point to Daniel and the Psalms as probably already included in the canon, and emphasize them as among the most precious documents which the nation possessed. Doubtless the books in mind were religious books, as it was a religious age!

7. *Philo* (*ca.* 20 *B.C.*-50 *A.D.*).

Philo is our next witness. He flourished in Alexandria between 20 B.C. and 50 A.D., leaving be-

[10] *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*, p. 40.

hind a voluminous literature. Unfortunately he does not yield much of positive value for our present purpose. His evidence is largely negative. He nowhere mentions the tripartite division of the Old Testament, which is known to have existed in his day; and he never quotes from Ezekiel, the Five Megilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Chronicles, or the Twelve Minor Prophets (except Hosea, Jonah and Zechariah). But his chief defect was his attitude to scripture in general; he held a loose view of inspiration. According to Philo, inspiration was by no means confined to the sacred scriptures; according to him, all truly wise and virtuous men are inspired and capable of expressing the hidden things of God. Still, as Green rightfully contends, "Philo's loose views of inspiration cannot be declared irreconcilable with the acceptance of a fixed canon, unless it is first shown that he places others whom he thinks inspired on a level with the writers of Scripture. This he never does." [11]

Philo's reverence for the Law was unbounded. In this respect he is the type of other Alexandrians. He quotes predominatingly from the Law. Moses to him was the source of all wisdom, even the wisdom of the Gentiles. Concerning the laws of Moses, he is reported by Eusebius as saying: "The Jews have not changed so much as a single word in them.

---

[11] *General Introd. to the Old Testament:* The Canon, p. 130.

They would rather die a thousand deaths than detract anything from these laws and statutes." On the other hand, Philo never quotes any of the apocryphal books. Hence it may safely be assumed that his canon was essentially ours; but as a witness he adds practically nothing to our knowledge of the actual size of the Old Testament in his time. With our next witness it is different.

8. *The New Testament as a Witness to the Old* (*ca.* 40-100 *A.D.*).

The evidence furnished by the New Testament is of the highest importance. Summed up, it gives the unmistakable impression that when the New Testament was written (ca. 40-100 A.D.) there was a definite and fixed canon of Old Testament writings, to which authoritative appeal could be made. First of all, great importance must be attached to the names or titles ascribed to the Old Testament: thus, "the scripture" (John 10:35; 19:36; 2 Pet. 1:20); "the scriptures" (Matt. 22:29; Acts 18:24); holy scriptures" (Rom. 1:2); "sacred writings" (2 Tim. 3:15); "the law" (John 10:34; 12:34; 15:25; 1 Cor. 14:21); "law and prophets" (Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 22:40; Lk. 16:16; 24:44; Acts 13:15; 28:23). Such names or titles, though they do not define the limits of the canon, certainly assume the existence of a complete and authentic collection of Jewish writings which are already marked off from

all other literature as separate, sacred, and fixed. One passage in particular, John 10:35, by the way in which the term "scripture" is employed, seems to refer to the Old Testament canon as a whole: "the scripture cannot be broken." In like manner the expression "law and prophets" is often used in a comprehensive sense, referring to much more than merely the first and second divisions of the Old Testament; rather, it seems to refer to the old dispensation as a whole. The term "the law" is the most general of all, being frequently applied to the entire Old Covenant and apparently holding, in Christ's time, among the Jews a place akin to that which the term "the Bible" does with us. For example, John quotes texts from the prophets and even from the Psalms as part of "the Law" (John 10:34; 12:34; 15:25); in 1 Cor. 14:21, also, Paul cites Isaiah 28:11 as a part of "the law." Accordingly these names and titles are indicative of the fact that already, in New Testament times, there was an Old Testament code; on the other hand, they are never applied by New Testament writers to the Apocrypha or other uninspired writings.

One special passage furnishes clear evidence of the threefold division of the canon. Jesus said, "All things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me" (Lk. 24:44). But here again, as

in the Prologue of Jesus ben Sirach to Ecclesiasticus, there is great uncertainty as to the limits of the third division. Instead of saying, "the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings" as the Jews were wont to do, Luke says, "the law, the prophets, and the psalms." But it is obvious why the Psalms should have been adduced and emphasized by Jesus in support of his resurrection. It is because they especially testify of Christ; they were, therefore, the most important part of the third division for his immediate purpose; in fact, it is highly probable that they are meant to stand *a potiori* for the whole of the third division.[12]

Another passage seems to hint of the order and arrangement of the books in the Old Testament canon, designating 2 Chronicles as the very last, as it actually is in the Hebrew Bible. It reads: "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar" (Matt. 23:35; Lk. 11:51). In order to appreciate the bearing of this passage upon the matter in hand, it must be remembered that in the modern arrangements of the Old Testament books in Hebrew, Chronicles does really stand last. In other words, the Hebrew Bible closes with Chronicles, instead of Malachi as in the English Bible. Now, the murder of Zachariah is the last recorded instance, accord-

[12] So Buddie, Art. "Canon," *Encyc. Biblica,* col. 669.

ing to the Jewish arrangement of the Old Testament books; it being found in 2 Chron. 24:20, 21. But this murder took place under Joash, King of Judah in the ninth century B.C. There is another, however, which is chronologically later, namely, that of Uriah son of Shemaiah, who was murdered in Jehoiakim's reign in the seventh century B.C. (cf. Jer. 26:23). Accordingly, the natural inference is, that, unless Chronicles already stood last in Christ's Old Testament, he would have said, not "from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah," etc., but "from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Uriah." In this case he would have been speaking historically and chronologically, and would have included in his sweep all the martyrs whose martyrdom *chronologically* is recorded in the Old Testament; whereas, in his actual sweep he included the whole range of Old Testament *literature;* in the same way in which we say, "from Genesis to Malachi." Hence, we may reasonably infer that in Christ's time the books of Chronicles stood at the end of their already closed canon of scripture.[13]

Another ground for thinking that the Old Testament canon was closed before the New Testament was written is the numerous citations made in the New Testament from the Old. Every book is quoted

[13] Of course there is a palpable objection to this conclusion in view of the fact that the Scriptures in Christ's day were probably still written by the Jews on separate rolls.

except Esther, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah. But these exceptions are not serious. The Twelve Minor Prophets were always treated by the Jews *en bloc* as one canonical work; hence, if one of the Twelve were quoted all were recognized. And the fact that 2 Chron. 24:20, 21 is quoted in Matt. 23:25 and Luke 11:51, presupposes also the canonicity of Ezra and Nehemiah, as originally these books were one with Chronicles; though it is possible they may already have been divided in Jesus' day. As for Esther, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, it is easy to see why they were not quoted: they probably failed to furnish New Testament writers material appropriate or needful for quotation. The New Testament writers simply had no occasion to make citations from them. What is much more noteworthy, they never quote from the Apocryphal books, though they sometimes show an acquaintance with them. Gigot, one of the most celebrated Roman Catholic authorities, frankly admits this. He says, "They never quote them explicitly, it is true, but time and again they borrow expressions and ideas from them." [14] As a matter of fact, New Testament writers felt free to quote from any literary source; for example, Paul on Mars' Hill cites to the learned Athenians an astronomical work of the Stoic Aratus of Cilicia, or perhaps from a Hymn to Jupiter by Cleanthes of Lycia, when he says, "For we are

[14] *General Introd. to the Study of the Scriptures,* p. 43.

also his offspring" (Acts 17:28). And Jude, in vs. 14,15, unquestionably quotes from the Book of Enoch (chs. 1:9; 60:8, etc.), which is not recognized as canonical by any, except possibly the church of Abyssinia. But, in any case, the mere quoting of a book does not canonize it; nor, on the other hand, does failure to quote a book exclude it. Quotation sanctions only the portion quoted; much depends on the manner in which the quotation is cited. The "Book of Jashar," for example, is not canonized because of the quotations made from it in Josh. 10:12-15 and 2 Sam. 1:19-27. In absolutely no case, on the other hand, is an Apocryphal book cited by New Testament authors as "Scripture," or as the work of the Holy Spirit. And the force of these statements is not weakened by the fact that New Testament writers usually quoted from the Septuagint rather than from the Hebrew Old Testament; for, "they are responsible," as Green puts it, "only for the inherent truthfulness of each passage in the form which they actually adopt." [15]

As a witness, therefore, the New Testament is of paramount importance. For, though it nowhere tells us the exact number of books contained in the Old Testament canon, by the titles it gives to many of the books of the Old Covenant, and the reverent way in which it cites them, it gives abundant evidence of the existence, already in the first century A.D., of a definite, authoritative and fixed collec-

[15] *General Introd. to the Old Testament:* The Canon, p. 145.

tion of Hebrew writings, commonly regarded as "Scripture."

9. *Fourth Esdras* (*ca.* 81-96 *A.D.*).

Fourth Esdras in Latin, or its equivalent Second Esdras in English, is a Jewish apocalypse which was written originally in Greek toward the close of the first century (ca. 81-96 A.D.). The passage of special interest to us here is chap. 14:19:48, which in most fabulous style relates how Ezra is given spiritual illumination to reproduce the Law which had been burned, and how, at the divine command, he secludes himself for a period of forty days, after which he betakes himself with five skilled scribes to the open country. There, a cup of water is offered him; he drinks, and then dictates to his five amanuenses continuously for forty days and nights, producing ninety-four books of which seventy are kept secret and twenty-four published. The direction of supreme importance reads as follows: "And it came to pass, when the forty days were fulfilled, that the Most High spake, saying, 'The first that thou hast written, publish openly, that the worthy may read it; but keep the seventy last, that thou mayest deliver them only to such as be wise among the people; for in them is the spirit of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge.' And I did so."

As is obvious, the story is pure fiction. Little wonder that a new version of it arose in the six-

teenth century, according to which the canon was completed, not by Ezra alone, but by a company of men known as "the Great Synagogue." But how shall we interpret the story? From the legend as recorded in 4 Esdras it is commonly inferred that the twenty-four books which were "openly published," which remain after subtracting seventy from ninety-four, are the canonical books of the Old Testament. If so, then this legend is the first witness we have to the number of books contained in the Old Testament canon. This number corresponds exactly with the usual number of sacred books according to Jewish count as we have seen above.[16] The legend, consequently, is not without value. Even as legend it witnesses to a tradition which existed as early as the first century, to the effect that the Jews then possessed twenty-four books of special sacredness. It also points to Ezra as the chief factor in the making of Scripture, and intimates that the Old Testament canon had long since been virtually closed.

10. *Josephus in his Contra Apionem* (*ca.* 100 *A.D.*).

Flavius Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born 37 A.D. He was a priest and a Pharisee. About 100 A.D. he wrote a controversial treatise, known as *Contra Apionem,* in defence of the Jews against their assailants, of whom Apion is taken as a

[16] Five of the *Torah;* eight in the *Nebhiim;* and eleven of the *Kethubhim.*

leading representative. Now Apion was a famous grammarian, who in his life had been hostile to the Jews. He had died some fifty years before *Contra Apionem* was written. Josephus wrote in Greek to Greeks. The important passage in his treatise when translated reads as follows:

"For it is not the case with us to have vast numbers of books disagreeing and conflicting with one another. We have but twenty-two, containing the history of all time, books that are justly believed in. And of these, five are the books of Moses, which comprise the laws and the earliest traditions from the creation of mankind down to the time of his (Moses') death. This period falls short but by a little of three thousand years. From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, the successor of Xerxes, the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote the history of the events that occurred in their own time, in thirteen books. The remaining four documents comprise hymns to God and practical precepts to men. From the days of Artaxerxes to our own time every event has indeed been recorded. But these recent records have not been deemed worthy of equal credit with those which preceded them, because the exact succession of the prophets ceased. But what faith we have placed in our own writings is evident by our conduct; for though so great an interval of time (*i.e.*, since they were written) has now passed, not a soul has ventured either to add, or to remove, or to alter a syllable. But it is instinctive in all Jews at once from

their very birth to regard them as commands of God, and to abide by them, and if need be, willingly to die for them."

The value of this remarkable passage for our study is obviously very great. In the first place, Josephus fixes the number of Jewish writings which were recognized as sacred at twenty-two, thus joining probably Ruth to Judges and Lamentations to Jeremiah, as was often done. He also classified them according to a threefold division, which is different from the ordinary Jewish classification and quite peculiar to himself, namely: five of Moses, thirteen of the prophets, and four hymns and maxims for human life. The five of Moses were, of course, the Pentateuch; the thirteen of the prophets probably included the eight regular *Nebhiim,* together with Daniel, Job, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther; the four hymns and maxims, which remain, would most naturally consist of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles. In any case there is little doubt but that his twenty-two books were exactly those of our Hebrew Old Testament canon.

Another very remarkable fact about Josephus' statement is the standard he assumes of canonicity, namely, *antiquity;* because as he says, since Artaxerxes' age, the succession of prophets had ceased. For it was the uniform tradition of Josephus' time that prophetic inspiration had ceased with Malachi (ca. 445-432 B.C.). Hence, according to him, the

canon was closed in the reign of Artaxerxes (465-425 B.C.). He does not pause to give an account of the closing of the canon he merely assumes it, apparently feeling that it is unnecessary. Prophecy had ceased, and automatically, therefore, the canon was finished; the fact did not require to be officially proclaimed.

As remarked above, the value of Josephus as a witness is very great. But, before we accept of his testimony, we ought to ask, How literally must we interpret his language? Was the Old Testament canon actually closed before the death of Artaxerxes in 425 B.C.? Is modern scholarship quite wrong in maintaining that several portions of the Hebrew scriptures were not composed until later, in the Maccabean Age (170-164 B.C.)? Green is inclined to take Josephus literally.[17] But Josephus is often far from reliable in matters of chronology. For example, in his Antiquities[18] he dates the story of Esther as the record of an event which occurred in the reign of Artaxerxes I, whereas it happened in the reign of Xerxes; while in the same work he places Ezra under Xerxes, whereas he flourished in the time of Artaxerxes. On the whole, therefore, it seems safer, and on internal grounds saner, to regard Josephus' statements concerning the antiquity of the Jewish canon as the language, not of a careful historian, but of a partisan in debate. In his debate

[17] *General Introd. to the Old Testament:* The Canon, pp. 40, 78.

[18] XI, vi, 13.

with Apion, instead of expressing absolute fact, he was reflecting the popular belief of his time. Reduced to its lowest terms, therefore, the element of real truth in what he says was simply this: he merely voiced a popular tradition, which at that time was undisputed; a tradition, however, which had probably required a long period, perhaps one or two hundred years, to develop. For we may well assume that the completed canon of the Old Testament, numbering, as Josephus says, twenty-two books, was no *new* thing in 100 A.D.

11. *The Councils of Jamnia* (*ca.* 90 *and* 118 *A.D.*).

According to certain traditions preserved in the Mishna, two councils of Jewish rabbis were held in 90 and 118 A.D., respectively, at Jabne, or Jamnia, not far south of Joppa, near the Mediterranean coast, at which the books of the Old Testament, notably Ecclesiastes and Canticles, were discussed and their canonicity ratified. Rabbi Gamaliel II probably presided, and Rabbi Akiba was the chief spirit of the council. We have no accurate record of what was actually decided by these synods or councils, but by many modern authorities it is thought that the great controversy which had been going on for over a century between the rival Jewish schools of Hillel and Shammai was now brought to a close, and that in these councils the canon was formally and officially restricted to our thirty-nine books. It is, therefore, possible that at

Jamnia the limits of the Hebrew canon were officially and finally determined by Jewish authority; not, however, that official sanction created public opinion, but rather only confirmed it

12. *The Talmud* (*ca.* 200-500 *A.D.*).

The Talmud consists of two parts: one, the Mishna, which is a collection of systematized traditions compiled about 200 A.D.; the other, the Gemara, a "vast and desultory commentary on the Mishna," which was completed about 500 A.D. In a Baraitha, or unauthorized gloss, known as the Baba Bathra (14b), a Babylonian tractate, it is related in what "order" the various books of the Old Testament stand, and especially who "wrote" them. But the Talmud says absolutely nothing about the formation of the canon. The mere writing of a book is a long way from getting it *canonized;* though to later Jews the two ideas were closely akin. As a witness the Babylonian tractate known as the Baba Bathra is of little value, except that it confirms the tripartite division of the books and is a good specimen of Talmudic speculation.[19]

During the second century A.D., doubts arose in Jewish minds concerning four books, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, but in no case

---

[19] For the full text of the passage in the Baba Bathra, see Ryle, *Canon of the Old Testament,* pp. 273ff, where Marx's translation of the passage referred to is given complete.

were the doubts serious, or did rabbinical controversies affect public opinion.[20]

This brings us to the end of our examination of the twelve chief witnesses to the size of the Old Testament canon in the minds of the Jews at the opening of the Christian era. In our survey we have discovered: (1) that though the Old Testament, as a witness to itself, says nothing about its *canonization,* it does repeatedly tell how carefully the Law was *preserved;* (2) that the Samaritan Pentateuch is by no means a reliable witness to the

[20] For example, in a certain Talmudic tractate it is related that an attempt was made to withdraw (literally, "conceal" or "hide") the Book of Proverbs because of the contradictions in Chapter 26:4, 5, but on deeper investigation it was withdrawn. In another section of the Talmud, Rabbi Akiba is represented as saying concerning Canticles: "God forbid that any man of Israel should deny that the Song of Songs *defileth the hands,* for the whole world is not equal to the day in which the Song of Songs was given to Israel. For all Scriptures are holy, but the Song of Songs is the holiest of holy." Such extravagant language inclines one to feel that real doubt must have existed in the minds of several influential men at that time to elicit a refutation of this strong character. But Jewish doubts were evidently much stronger concerning Ecclesiastes. In one tractate it is stated: "The wise men tried to hide it because its language was often self-contradictory (cf. Eccl. 7:3 and 2:2; 4:2 and 9:4), but they did not because the beginning and the ending of it are composed of words from the Torah." Likewise Esther was vigorously disputed by both the Jerusalem and Babylonian Gemaras, because the name of God was not found in it; but a Rabbi Simeon ben Lakkish (ca. 300 A.D.) defended its canonicity, putting Esther on an equality with the Law, above the Prophets and the other Writings. Ezekiel and Jonah were sometimes discussed but no one ever raised serious doubts against either; Jonah was never really doubted till the twelfth century, A.D.

size of the Old Testament at the time when the renegade Manasseh was expelled from Jerusalem by Nehemiah; (3) that the Septuagint version, as we know it through the Christian manuscripts of it extant (the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrinus) is in no sense a proof that the Jews of Alexandria, who translated it, originally possessed a "larger" canon than did the Jews of Palestine; (4) that Jesus ben Sirach is a witness to the supposition that in his day the process of canonization of the Prophets was still going on; (5) that his grandson, in the Prologue to his translation into Greek of his grandfather's work, is the first witness to the tripartite division of Old Testament writings; (6) that the Books of the Maccabees warrant the conclusion that the book of Psalms was as early as the first century B.C. already probably included in the Jewish canon; (7) that Philo's testimony though largely negative, in view of the fact that his views of inspiration were low, yet witnesses against the apocryphal books as no part of Holy Scripture; (8) that the New Testament is the most explicit witness of all in the entire series, because of the names and titles it ascribes to the Old Testament books to which reference is made, and also because of the reverent manner in which said books are cited; (9) that Fourth Esdras is the first explicit witness to the number of books included in the canon of the Jews, namely twenty-four, which presumably correspond exactly with the canon of all Protestants; (10) that

Josephus is another witness to the number of books in the Old Testament, namely twenty-two, though in claiming extreme *antiquity* for them he probably voices a generally believed tradition rather than an historical fact; (11) that the Councils of Jamnia may with some plausibility be considered the official occasion on which the Jews pronounced upon the limits of their canon; and (12) that any doubts which existed during the second century concerning certain books, were not really serious, as the Talmud silently witnesses.

From all this we conclude, that the Law was canonized, or as we might better express it, was recognized, as authoritative, first about 444 B.C.; that the Prophets were elevated to an even footing with the Law considerably later, perhaps about 200 B.C.! and that the Writings received authoritative sanction at a time still later, probably about 100 B.C. Though there were never three separate independent canons, there were three separate classes of sacred writings, which between the years 450 and 100 B.C. quite probably stood on their own individual and separate bases, and only gradually became authoritative. For, the tripartite division of the Old Testament canon may well have been due to material differences as to their contents, as well as to chronology.

V

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

In making the transition from the Jewish Church to the Christian, we find the same canon cherished by all. From the middle of the second century A.D. onwards there constantly occur patristic statements on the extent of the Old Testament canon, which avowedly rest upon Jewish authority. The Early Christians of all sects were for a long time disposed to accept without question the canon of the Jews. For about three centuries, indeed, all branches of the Christian Church were practically agreed on the limits set by the Jews; but eventually, the Western Church became divided, some alleging that Christ sanctioned a "larger" canon of Alexandria, which included many of the apocryphal books, while others adhered, as the Jews have always done, to the strict Hebrew canon in Palestine.

1. *In the Eastern Church.*

Taking the Eastern or Oriental churches first, the evidence they furnish is briefly as follows: The Peshitto, or Syriac version, dating from about 150 A.D. omits Chronicles; Justin Martyr, about 164,

held to a canon identical with that of the Jews; the canon of Melito, bishop of Sardis, who (ca. 170) made a journey to Palestine in order carefully to investigate the matter, omits Esther;[1] Origen, who was educated in Alexandria, and was one of the most learned of the Greek Fathers, some time before his death (ca. 254), also set himself the task of knowing the "Hebrew verity" of the Old Testament text, and gives us a list[2] in which he reckons the number of books as twenty-two, thus agreeing with Josephus. Inadvertently he omits the Twelve Minor Prophets, in giving a catalogue of their names; but this is manifestly an oversight on the part of either a scribe, or of Eusebius himself, as he explicitly states the number of the books to be twenty-two, and then names but twenty-one.[3] Coming down to the fourth century, the so-called Canon of Laodicea (ca. 363) included only the canonical books of the Jews, rejecting the Apocrypha. Athanasius (d. 365) gives a list in which Esther is classed as among the non-canonical books, but he elsewhere admits that "Esther is considered canonical by the Hebrews." However, he included Baruch (as Origen did), and also the Epistle of Jeremiah with the Book of Jeremiah. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium (c. 380), speaks of Esther as received by

[1] Melito's list is the first Christian list we have; it has been preserved to us by Eusebius in his *Eccl. Hist.* IV, 26.

[2] Preserved to us also by Eusebius, *Idem,* VI, 5.

[3] Origin adds Baruch to Jeremiah-Lamentations, however.

some only. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (d. 386), gives a list corresponding with the Hebrew canon, except that he includes Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah. Gregory of Nazianzus in Cappadocia (c. 390) omits Esther. But Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch (560), and Leontius of Byzantium (580), both held to the strict Jewish canon of twenty-two books.

In short, the Nestorians generally doubted Esther, and many were not sure of the books of Chronicles. This was due, doubtless, to the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 390-457), who questioned the authority of Chronicles and Esther, and likewise of Ezra, Nehemiah and Job. The Oriental churches as a whole, however, never canonized the Apocrypha.

2. *In the Western Church.*

During the first three or four centuries of the Christian era in the Western Church, the tendency was to receive everything which had been traditionally read in the churches. Through this principle great confusion was produced; for usage and theory based upon merit were often in conflict. A church Father might declare an apocryphal book as uninspired and yet quote it as "Scripture," and even introduce his quotation with the accepted formula, "As the Holy Ghost saith." Theologically the Early Fathers of the Western Church held to a strict canon, homiletically they used a larger one. But

even usage was not uniform: 3 and 4 Esdras and the Book of Enoch are sometimes quoted as "Holy Writ," yet the Western Church never received these books as a part of the canon. The criterion of usage was accordingly too broad. Theory was gradually forgotten, and the occasional use of the Apocryphal writings led to the obliteration of the distinction between the disputed and undisputed books which the Hebrews had received, and in due time many of them were incorporated in the great Biblical manuscripts such as the Codex Vaticanus, and because they were frequently read in the churches they finally received a quasi-canonization.[4]

Tertullian of Carthage (ca. 150-230) is the first of the Latin Fathers whose writings have been preserved. He gives the number of Old Testament books as twenty-four, the same as Fourth Esdras. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in France (350-368), gives a catalogue in which he speaks of "Jeremiah and his epistle," yet his list numbers only twenty-two. Ruffinus of Aquileia in Italy (d. 410) likewise gives a complete list, numbering exactly twenty-two. Jerome, also, the learned monk of Bethlehem (d. 420), gives the number of canonical books as twenty-two, and makes them correspond to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet; explaining that the five double books (1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Jeremiah-Lamentations) correspond to the five

[4] Cf. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament,* pp. 180ff.

Hebrew letters which have special additional forms when standing at the end of a word. In his famous *Prologue Galeatus,* or "Helmed Preface," to the books of Samuel and Kings,[5] he explicitly declares himself as favouring the strict canon of the Jews; rejecting the authority of the deutero-canonical books in the most outspoken manner, even distinguishing carefully the apocryphal additions to Esther and Daniel. As the celebrated Roman Catholic writer, Gigot, very frankly allows, "Time and again this illustrious doctor (Jerome) of the Latin church rejects the authority of the deutero-canonical books in the most explicit manner." [6] Nor is his position at all modified by the fact that he was prevailed upon by his friends to translate hastily Tobit and Judith, or by the concession in his Prologue to the Books of Solomon, that "the apocryphal books may be read for purposes of edification"; or, even by the fact that in a letter to Pammachius he applies to Ecclesiasticus the expression, "divine scripture"; for all that can possibly be deduced from these circumstances, in face of his explicit testimony on the subject, is that he consented, under pressure, to give the apocryphal books an intermediate position. Whenever Jerome expressed him-

---

[5] Written in 391; also in his prefaces, respectively, to Esdras (394), the Books of Solomon (398) and Jeremiah (414); likewise in his epistle to Paulinus (394), but especially in a private letter written to a holy Roman matron named Laeta (403).

[6] *General Introd. to the Holy Scriptures,* p. 56.

self formally upon the great subject of the canon, he never failed to draw a clear line of demarcation between the books of the Hebrew Bible and later additions to it.[7]

Contemporaneous with Jerome in Bethlehem lived Augustine in North Africa (353-430). He was the bishop of Hippo; renowned as thinker, theologian and saint. Besides being a mystic, an administrator and a controversialist, he was famous also as an ecclesiastic—at once the father of the papacy and the forerunner of Protestantism. He was the leading spirit in the three great Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397 and 419), and closed, as it were, the great debate of the previous generations on the subject of how large shall be the Bible. In his essay on *Christian Doctrine,* he catalogues the books of Scripture, which had been transmitted by the Fathers for public reading in the Church, giving their number as forty-four, with which, he says, "the authority of the Old Testament is ended." These probably corresponded pretty closely to the present Old Testament canon of Roman Catholics.[8] But it is not to be supposed that Augustine made no distinction between the proto- and

[7] Cf. Westcott, *The Bible in the Church,* pp. 182, 183; Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church,* p. 157; Briggs, *The Study of Holy Scripture,* p. 139; and Gigot, *General Introd. to the Holy Scripture,* p. 58.

[8] Cf. Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church,* pp. 158-159; Gigot, *General Introduction,* p. 60; Westcott, *The Bible in the Church,* pp. 186-187; Green, *The Canon,* p. 168.

deutero-canonical books. On the contrary, he limited the term "canonical" in its strict sense to the books which are inspired and received by the Jews, and denied that in support of doctrine the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were of unquestioned authority, though he allowed that long custom had entitled them to respect. And when a passage from Second Maccabees was urged by his opponents in defence of suicide, he rejected their proof by showing that the book was not received into the Hebrew canon to which Christ bore witness. At the second Council, however, that of Carthage (397), a decree was ratified, most probably with his approval, which in effect placed all the canonical and deutero-canonical books on the same level, and in the course of time they actually became considered by some as of equal authority. A few years later, another Council at Carthage (419) took the additional step of voting that their own decision concerning the canon should be confirmed by Boniface, the Bishop of Rome; accordingly, thereafter, the question of how large the Bible should be, became a matter to be settled by ecclesiastical authority rather than by a critical evaluation of the historical facts.

From the fourth to the sixteenth century, the process of gradually widening the limits of the canon continued, until Pope Gelasius (492-496) finally issued a decretal, or list, which included the Old Testament Apocrypha. By this decree the formal closing of the canon in the West came temporarily

to an end. Yet, even after this official act of the papacy, the sentiment in the western church remained divided. Some followed the strict canon of Jerome, while others favoured the larger canon of Augustine, without noting his cautions and the distinctions he made between inspired and uninspired writings. Cassiodorus (556) and Isidore of Seville (636) place the lists of Jerome and Augustine side by side without deciding between them. Two bishops of North Africa, Primasius and Junilius (ca. 550), reckon twenty-four books as strictly canonical, and explicitly state that the others are not of the same grade. Popular usage, however, was indiscriminate. Among Gentiles there was no sound Hebrew tradition. Consequently there was a strong inclination to let Christian usage rather than historical facts determine the place of the apocryphal books in the canon. During all the early centuries, for nearly twelve hundred years, indeed, there were few lists of Old Testament books which included them.

At the Council of Florence (1442), however, a new step was taken in the direction of their canonization, when "Eugenius IV, with the approval of the Fathers of that august assembly, declared all the books found in the Latin Bibles then in use to be inspired by the same Holy Spirit, without distinguishing them into classes or categories." [9] Though this bull of Pope Eugenius IV did not deal with the *canonicity* of the apocryphal books, it did proclaim

[9] Cf. Gigot, *General Introd. to the Holy Scriptures*, p. 71.

their *inspiration;* so that men ever afterwards were able to claim that all the books of the Old Testament, the apocryphal as well as the canonical, were *equally inspired.* Nevertheless, down to the Council of Trent (1546), the apocryphal books possessed only inferior canonical authority; and when men spoke of canonical scripture in the strict sense, these were not included.

Luther, the great Saxon Reformer of the sixteenth century, marks an epoch in the history of the Christian Old Testament canon. In translating the scriptures into German, he gave the deutero-canonical books only an intermediate position between the Old and New Testaments, thus setting them apart in a class by themselves, distinct from the other books of Scripture which were universally recognized as of first rank, and indisputably canonical. He even went so far as to question the right of Esther to be in the canon; and as for the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and Jude, and the Book of Revelation, he placed them last in the New Testament, to indicate that in his personal judgment they were non-apostolic and therefore of inferior quality to the others in the New Testament. But Luther never actually excluded any already recognized book from his own Biblical canon. The Lutheran Church holds a similar position. For while it does not expressly define the limits of the canon, it usually places the apocryphal writings by themselves, or at least assigns to them a place distinct and

separate from Holy Scripture. This indeed was the attitude of all the early reformers, both German and French. In the Zürich Bible of 1529, as in the Genevan Version in English of 1560, the apocryphal books were placed apart with special headings by themselves.[10] Thus the early Reformers did not entirely reject the apocryphal writings; for it was not an easy task to undo the usage and growing traditions of centuries. They therefore compromised, assigning the deutero-canonical and intermediate position, as was practically done by many during the preceding millennium.

The Roman Church had now long vacillated between the strict canon of Jerome and the larger one of Augustine. But she finally realized that something drastic must be done. She, therefore, resolved to settle forever the matter in an ecclesiastical and dogmatic manner. Only thus could she hope to stay the tide of the Lutherans against her. Accordingly, the Council of Trent, more celebrated for its boldness than for its erudition, and composed of only fifty-three prelates, was called, and after a prolonged discussion, decreed at their fourth sitting, April 8, 1546, that the apocryphal books were

[10] With a title such as the following: "Here are the books which are numbered by the ancients among the biblical writings, but which are not found in the Hebrew canon . . . It is true that they are not to be despised, inasmuch as they contain good and useful doctrine. At the same time, it is very right that what was given by the Holy Ghost should have preëminence above what came from men."

equal in authority and canonical value to the other books of sacred Scripture; and in order to make this decree effective they added: "If, however, anyone receive not as sacred and canonical the said books entire with all their facts, and as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the Old Latin Vulgate edition . . . let him be anathema!" The decree was, of course, only the logical outcome of the ever-accumulating snowball tendency in the Western church of continually adding to the Church's standards, and a colossal blunder, without any real historical justification whatever. It is vain to attempt to justify the action of the Council of Trent on the ground that "the Fathers simply wished to affirm solemnly against the errors of the time the ancient faith of the church"; or, that "the deutero-canonical books were never treated by the Christian Church as mere human compositions"; or, that "the Council innovated nothing, but simply followed the decisions of the Council of Florence" (1442);[11] for, Florence never *canonized* the apocryphal writings, but only declared concerning their *inspiration*. After the Council of Trent adjourned, two of its leading spirits, Catherinus and Sixtus of Sienna, and later others, especially Bernard Lamy (d. 1714), openly challenged and refuted the decree of the Council by saying, "Nevertheless, they are not of the same

[11] As Gigot, *General Introduction to the Holy Scriptures,* pp. 80ff.

authority." [12] Not long after the decree was published, Martin Chemnitz also made the very sage remark, that "the later Church could never by decree make certain that of which the early Church upon historical evidence had remained uncertain." [13]

The historical effect of the decree of Trent upon the Roman Catholic Church was inevitable: it closed definitely and forever the field of study against all free research. Naturally, therefore, the Vatican Council of 1870 not only reiterated the degree but found it easy to take still another step in the wrong direction, and canonize *tradition!* This closes absolutely the door to further scientific investigation. Yet, neither the decree of Trent nor that of the Vatican was the result of fresh and thorough-going historical study; rather, dogmatism conquered.

Repeated endeavours were made by Protestants during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to have the apocryphal books removed from the Bible. The Synod of Dort (1618-19), Gormarus, Deodatus, and others, sought to accomplish it, but failed. The only success achieved was in getting them separated from the strictly canonical writings and grouped by themselves, as in the Gallican Confession of 1559, the Anglican Confession of 1562, and the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566. The Puritan Confes-

[12] A similar view was expressed by Jahn, another Roman Catholic authority, *Introd. to the Old Testament,* pp. 48ff; and by Chauvin, *Leçons d'Introduction Générale,* p. 249.

[13] *Examen Concil Trid.,* 1565; quoted by Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church,* p. 194.

sion, however, went a long step farther, and boldly declared that they were of a purely secular character. The various new versions of the Bible, at that time being made, such as the Zürich (1529), the French (1535), placed them by themselves, apart from the acknowledged books, as a kind of appendix.[14] The first English version to omit them altogether was an edition of King James' Version published in 1629. But the custom of printing them by themselves, between the Old and New Testaments, continued pretty generally till 1825, when the Edinburgh Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society protested that the society should no longer translate these apocryphal writings and send them to the heathen. The Society finally yielded and decided to exclude them (May 3, 1827). Since then, Protestants in Great Britain and America have quite ceased issuing the apocryphal writings as a part of sacred Scripture. In Europe also, since 1850, the tendency has been to eliminate them.[15]

---

[14] Cf. also Coverdale's English Translation of 1536; Mathews' of 1537; the second edition of the Great Bible of 1540; the Bishops' of 1568; and the Authorized Version of 1611.

[15] In 1850 a prize was offered by the Baden Administration Council of the Inner Mission of Carlsruhe for an essay on "The character and worth of the Apocrypha." This aroused debate. One practical result was that the so-called Bergische Bibelgesellschaft passed a resolution to the effect that no more Bibles containing the Apocrypha would be circulated by them gratis, or even at a reduced rate, but at full cost (cf. Buhl, *Canon and Text,* p. 70; also, Bissell, *Commentary on the Apocrypha,* in Lange's Bible, p. 58).

The Church of England, however, and to some extent the American Episcopal Church, do not wholly exclude them; certain "readings" being selected from the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch, and read on week days between October 27th and November 17th. Yet, when the English Revised Version appeared in 1885, though it was the special product in a very true sense of the Church of England, the apocryphal books were quite omitted from the edition, there being not so much as a reference to them. The Irish Church, likewise, has removed them; and the American Revised Version, Standard Edition (1901), ignores these so-called deutero-canonical books altogether.

VI

THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS SELF-CONDEMNED

Before excluding and dismissing the apocryphal books entirely from our Bible it may be well to pause briefly to inquire what is the intrinsic value of these deutero-canonical writings which have stood so long upon the border-land of the Hebrew Canon? What their merits; what their defects? Why accepted by some and rejected by others? Let it be said with gladness and appreciation that they unquestionably contain many good moral teachings; that they supplement the history of ancient Judaism and bring it down to the Christian era; and that many of the religious doctrines of the canonical Scriptures are to be found also in them. On the other hand, it is quite as true that they contain practically nothing of value which could possibly assist in furthering the interests of Christianity. "To place these books on the same footing with the Law and the Prophets is quite impossible to the historical student. There is a distinct line of demarcation between the Apocrypha and the books of the Old Testament. The difference can be

felt rather than defined.[1] By their contents they are really self-condemned. Here are a few only of the many blemishes that might be enumerated:[2]

1. *The Book of Tobit* teaches the meritorious value of almsgiving: thus,

"According to thy ability be merciful. If thou have much give abundantly: if thou have little, take care even so to bestow willingly a little. For this thou storest up to thyself a good reward for the day of necessity. For alms deliver from all sin, and from death, and will not suffer the soul to go into darkness. Alms shall be a great confidence before the most high God, to all them that give it." (Tobit 4:8-12).

"For alms delivereth from death, and the same is that which purgeth away sins, and maketh to find mercy and life everlasting." (12:9).[3]

The Book of Tobit is also infused with a spirit of Oriental quackery and puerility, and hence is undignified and unbecoming the Canon of God: thus,

---

[1] So W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* pp. 156-157; Budde, Art. "Canon," *Encyc. Biblica,* col. 674; Wildeboer, *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament,* p. 164.

[2] The citations which follow are taken exclusively from the Rheims-Douay Roman Catholic Bible, bearing the imprimatur of His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons.

[3] Cf. Ecclus. 3:33, "Alms resisteth sins"; also, Ecclus. 29:11-15; and I Pet. 4:8, "Love covereth a multitude of sins."

"Tobias went forward and the dog followed him, and he lodged the first night by the river Tigris. And he went out to wash his feet, and behold a monstrous fish came up to devour him. And Tobias being afraid of him, cried out with a loud voice, saying, Sir, he cometh upon me. And the angel said to him, Take him by the gill and draw him to thee. Then the angel said to him: Take out the entrails of the fish, and lay up his heart, and his gall, and his liver for thee: for these are necessary for useful medicines. And when he had done so, Tobias asked the angel and said to him: I beseech thee brother Azarias, tell me what remedies are these things good for, which thou hast bid me keep of the fish? And the angel answering said to him. If thou put a little piece of its heart upon coals, the smoke thereof driveth away all kinds of devils, either from man or from woman, so that they come no more to them. And the gall is good for anointing the eyes." (Tobit 6:1-9).

Again,

"Raphael said to Tobias: Take with thee of the gall of the fish, for it will be necessary. As soon as thou shalt come into thy house, forthwith adore the Lord thy God: and giving thanks to him, go to thy father and kiss him. And immediately anoint his eyes with this gall of the fish which thou carriest with thee. For be assured that his eyes shall be presently opened, and thy father shall see the light of heaven, and shall rejoice in the sight of thee. Then the dog, which had been with them in the way, ran before, and coming as if he had brought the

news, shewed his joy by his fawning and wagging his tail." (Tobit 11:4-9).[4]

2. *The Book of Judith,* approves of deception and falsehood: for example, Judith, a widow, when Holofernes and his army are besieging the city of Bethulia, prays,

"O Lord, may his pride be cut off with his own sword. Let him (Holofernes) be caught in the net of his own eyes in my regard, and do thou strike him by the graces of the words of my lips." (Judith 9:12, 13).

Again,

"When she had ceased to cry to the Lord, she rose and put away the garments of her widowhood, and anointed herself and plaited the hair of her head, and adorned herself with all her ornaments, so that she appeared to all men's eyes incomparably lovely. And it came to pass, when she passed through the gates and went down the hill, about the break of day, the watchmen of the Assyrians met her, and stopped her, saying: Whence comest thou? or whither goest thou? And she answered: "I am a daughter of the Hebrews, and I am fled from them because I knew they would be made a prey to you,

[4] Attached to Tobit 11:9 in the Roman Catholic Douay Bible is this apologetic footnote: "This may seem a very minute circumstance to be recorded in sacred history (namely, the wagging of the dog's tail): but as we learn from our Saviour (St. Matthew 5:18), there are *iotas* and *tittles* in the word of God: that is to say, things that appear minute, but which have indeed a deep and mysterious meaning in them"!

because they despised you, and would not of their own accord yield themselves, that they might find mercy in your sight." (Judith 10:1-12).[5]

On the other hand, another passage records how a simple breach of the ceremonial law became a deadly sin and caused destruction:

"And the consecrated things of the Lord their God which God forbade them to touch, in corn, wine, and oil, these have they purposed to make use of, and they design to consume the things which they ought not to touch with their hands; therefore, because they do these things, it is certain they will be given up to destruction." (Judith 11:12).

3. *The Book of Wisdom* teaches the doctrines of purgatory, the preëxistence of the soul, and that the body is a clog upon the soul: thus,

"But the souls of the just are in the hand of God, and torment of death shall not touch them. And though in the sight of men they suffered torments their hope is full of immortality. As gold in the furnace he hath proved them, and as a victim of a

---

[5] To Judith 10:12 the Douay Version attaches this very significant apologetic annotation: "In this and the following chapters some things are related to have been said by Judith, which seem hard to reconcile with truth. But all that is related in scripture of the servants of God, is not approved by the scripture; and even the saints in their good enterprises may sometimes slip into venial sins."

holocaust he hath received them, and *in time* there shall be respect had to them." (Wisdom 3:1-6).

"And I was a witty child and had received a good soul. And whereas I was more good, I came to a body undefiled." (Wisdom 8:19, 20).

"For the corruptible body is a load upon the soul, and the earthly habitation presseth down the mind that museth upon many things." (Wisdom 9:15).

4. *The Book of Ecclesiasticus* forbids giving bread to the wicked; and recommends torture for a malicious slave: thus,

"If thou do good, know to whom thou dost it, and there shall be much thanks for thy good deeds. Give to the good, and receive not a sinner. Do good to the humble, and give not to the ungodly: hold back thy bread, and give it not to him, lest thereby he overmaster thee." (Ecclus. 12:1-6).

Again,

"The yoke and the thong bend a stiff neck, and continued labours bow a slave. Torture and fetters are not for a malicious slave: send him to work, that he be not idle." (Ecclus. 33:27, 28).

5. *The Book of Baruch* teaches that God hears *the prayers of the dead:* thus,

"O Lord Almighty, the God of Israel, hear now the prayer of the dead of Israel, and of their children, that have sinned before thee." (Baruch 3:4).

6. *The Epistle of Jeremiah* predicts that the captivity shall last seven generations instead of seventy years:

"For the sins that you have committed before God, you shall be carried away captive into Babylon, by Nebuchadnezzar the King of Babylon. And when you are come into Babylon you shall be there many years, and for a long time, even to *seven generations*, and after that I will bring you away from thence with peace." (Baruch 6, entitled, "The Epistle of Jeremias; cf. Jer. 25:11; 29:10).

7. *The First Book of Maccabees* implicitly identifies Simon Maccabeus as the Messiah, and finds in the Maccabean rule the fulfilment of Messianic hope: thus,

"The people seeing the acts of Simon, and to what glory he meant to bring his nation, made him their prince and high priest. And the king Demetrius confirmed him in the high priesthood and glorified him with great glory. And the Jews and their priests consented that he should be their prince and high priest for ever, till there should arise a faithful prophet. And Simon accepted thereof, and was well pleased to execute the office of the high priesthood and to be chief over all." (1 Macc. 14:35-47).[6]

[6] Buhl, commenting on this passage says, "It cannot be denied that the description of the happy reign of Simon (1 Macc. 14) is given with so many unmistakably Messianic expressions, that the readers must have received the impression that the author had seen in the Maccabean rule the fulfilment of the hope of Israel, which therefore must place the book outside of the Old Testament circle." (*Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, p. 75).

8. *The Second Book of Maccabees* relates how the secred fire upon the temple altar when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem (586 B.C.) was miraculously preserved till Nehemiah's time (458 B.C.) : thus,

"When our fathers were led into Persia, the priests that then were worshippers of God took privately the fire from the altar, and hid it in a valley where there was a deep pit without water, and they kept it safe, so that the place was unknown to all men. But when many years had passed (130 more or less), and it pleased God that Nehemiah should be sent by the king of Persia, he sent some of the posterity of those priests that had hid it, to seek for the fire; and as they told us, they found no fire but thick water. Then he bade them draw it up, and bring it to him: and the priest Nehemiah commanded the sacrifices that were laid on, to be sprinkled with the same water, both the wood, and the things that were laid upon it. And when this was done, and the time came that the sun shone out, which before was in a cloud, there was a great fire kindled, so that all wondered. And the priests sung hymns till the sacrifice was consumed." (2 Macc. 1:19-30).

Second Maccabees tells also how Jeremiah, when Jerusalem was destroyed, hid the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense: thus,

"The prophet Jeremiah, being warned by God, commanded that the tabernacle and the ark should

accompany him, till he came forth to the mountain where Moses went up (Nebo) and saw the inheritance of God. And when Jeremiah came hither he found a hollow cave: and he carried in thither the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar of incense, and so stopped the door." (2 Macc. 2:4, 5).

Second Maccabees also describes an apparition which prevented Heliodorus from invading the sanctity of the temple and taking away the treasures deposited in the temple: thus,

"For there appeared to them (Heliodorus and his body guard) a horse with a terrible rider upon him, adorned with a very rich covering: and he ran fiercely and struck Heliodorus with his fore feet." (2 Macc. 3:25).

The Second Book of Maccabees commends *praying for the dead:*

"And making a gathering, Judas sent twelve thousand drahms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness, had great grace laid up for them. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." (2 Macc. 12:43-46).

Second Maccabees tacitly justifies suicide: thus,

"Now Razias, one of the ancients of Jerusalem, was accused to Nicanor, a man that was a lover of the city, and of good report, who for his affection was called the father of the Jews. This man, for a long time had held fast his purpose of keeping himself pure in the Jews' religion, and was ready to expose his body and life, that he might persevere therein. So Nicanor being willing to declare the hatred that he bore the Jews, sent five hundred soldiers to take him. Now as the multitude sought to rush into his house, and to break open the door, and to set fire to it, when he was ready to be taken, he struck himself with his sword;[7] choosing to die nobly rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked, and to suffer abuses unbecoming his noble birth." (2 Macc. 14:37-42).

Second Maccabees, as a matter of fact, lays no claim to inspiration: for example,

"So these things being done with relation to Nicanor, and from that time the city being possessed by the Hebrews, I also will here make an end of my narrative, which if I have done well, and as it becometh history it is what I desired: but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me. For as it is

[7] In an apologetic footnote of the Douay Bible to this passage (ch. 14:41) Augustine is quoted as having commented on it as follows: "The holy scripture relates the incident of Razias' suicide, but doth not praise it, as to be admired or imitated, and that either it was not well done by him, or at least not proper in this time of grace."

hurtful to drink always wine, or always water, but pleasant to use sometimes the one, and sometimes the other; so if the speech be always nicely framed, it will not be grateful to the readers. But here it shall be ended." (2 Macc. 15:38-40).

The apocryphal additions to the Book of Esther and to the Book of Daniel are marred by similar defects which mark them as of secondary value. And so, in view of such blemishes, we are forced to allow that these so-called deutero-canonical books are not of equal authority to those of the Hebrew canon, and that they ought ever to remain and be labelled what they were in the beginning, namely, as unworthy of a place in the Canon of Scripture. Their historical importance we willingly concede, but their teaching and spirit, as we have seen, are at points nothing less than contradictory to the spirit of the acknowledged canon.[8]

[8] The actual test of canonicity, it should ever be clearly borne in mind, is, on the one hand, the inner voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in the writings themselves, and on the other, the judgment and usage of the church. Both are applied by all branches of the Christian Church. For example, the Catholic Gigot rejects Third Maccabees "because it abounds in absurd details" (*General Introduction,* p. 130); while the Protestant Green affirms that "the limits of the Canon must be determined mainly by external evidence; for it is an historical question" (*The Canon,* p. 195). The Holy Spirit, who inspired the original authors of the Bible, has likewise providentially inspired the church to recognize them as canonical and normative.

VII

THE MAKING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The books of the New Testament, like those of the Old, were only slowly recognized as worthy of being elevated to the rank of "scripture." The Bible of our Lord and His Apostles had been, of course, the books of the Old Testament alone; consequently when Christian writings began to be produced, and the oral story of Jesus' life was actually written down, though a long-felt want was met, the early Church Fathers were perforce compelled to distinguish between inspired writings and those which were not. For years even the Gospels and the Book of Acts were kept back from a place on a level with the inspired books of the Old Testament; but when new Christian writings came to be considered as worthy of a place in the Canon of Scripture, the unvarying criterion was adopted, that they must be known to be the writings of the apostles or by companions of the apostles.

While this is not the place to relate the origin of the books which eventually found a place in the New Testament canon, it should be remembered that they were, for the most part, composed between the

years 50 and 100 A.D. The oldest single paragraph, or section, of the New Testament ever written down was presumably the irenic deliverance of the Jerusalem Council, which is found in Acts 15:23-29, and very probably dates from ca. 50 A.D. The Epistle of James, however, may have been written a few years earlier, possibly as early as 45 A.D. The Epistles of Paul seem to have been written in the following order: 1 and 2 Thessalonians, ca. 51; Galatians, ca. 53; 1 and 2 Corinthians, ca. 54-56; Romans, ca. 57; Hebrews, ca. 59; Philippians, ca. 60; Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, ca. 62; 1 Timothy, ca. 63; Titus, ca. 66; and 2 Timothy, ca. 57; after these or synchronous with the Pastorals, the Acts and 1 Peter, ca. 65; 2 Peter(ca. 66-68; Mark, Luke and Matthew, ca. 68-70; Jude, ca. 75-80; 1 John, ca. 80-95; and 2 and 3 John, the Gospel of John, and the Book of Revelation, ca. 95-96 A.D.

At what time the actual process of canonizing these apostolic writings began, no one can definitely declare. Naturally the apostles, drawing near to the end of life, began to preserve, in written form, the oral teachings of Jesus which for a long time had been in circulation. Paul indeed hints of written documents, when, in writing to Timothy, he twice over urges him to "guard the deposit" (cf. 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14, A. R. V., Mg.). Beside these, on two separate occasions the Apostle requests that his epistles be read in the churches, respectively, to

which they were sent (1 Thess. 5:27; Col. 4:16). Peter, too, when speaking of how Paul had also written to the scattered Jews of Asia Minor, says, "As our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; as also in all his epistles . . . which the ignorant and unstead-fast wrest, as they do also the other scriptures!" (2 Pet. 3:15, 16). Paul even dares to claim that his writings are to be regarded as from God, when, for example, in 1 Cor. 7:10 he says, "But unto the married I give charge, *yea not I, but the Lord"*; and in 1 Thess. 4:15, when he declares that he speaks for the Lord: "For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord."* But, despite all these hints and claims, there was no completed New Testament canon at the close of the apostolic age. This is recognized and admitted on all sides.

1. *During the Sub-Apostolic Age* (*ca.* 100-120 *A.D.*).

It is in the Epistle of Barnabas (IV, 14), which dates from the close of the first century A.D., or, from the opening years of the second century, that the first quotation from a New Testament writing is cited as actual authority; for example, Matthew's statement that "Many are called but few chosen" (Matt. 22:14), which is specifically introduced with the significant words "as it is written"!

Clement of Rome in his *Second Epistle,* dating from about the same time, places certain "sayings" of our Lord as unquestionably on a level with the

"holy scriptures" of the Old Testament. Thus, in his letter written in the name of the Christians of Rome to the Christians of Corinth, he makes copious use of material found in Matthew and Luke; he also shows the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, Titus, and 1 Peter.

Polycarp, writing to the Philippians (ca. 110 A.D.), though he says nothing of the canon as such, tells of an interesting custom of those early days, namely, of exchanging and reading one another's letters, and of sending them about as encyclicals from one church to another. He says:

"I have received letters from you (the Philippians) and from Ignatius. You recommend me to send on yours to Syria; I shall do so either personally or by some other means. In return I send you the letter of Ignatius as well as others which I have in my hands, and for which you make request. I add them to the present one; they will serve to edify your faith and perseverance." [1]

In the light of this expressed custom, accordingly, it is not at all surprising to find that the Epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch (ca. 115 A.D.), show reverent acquaintanceship with the Gospel according to Matthew, and with several of the writings of the great Apostle, notably Philippians, Ephesians, Romans; also 1 Peter and 1 John. For Ignatius not only quotes these Epistles frequently, but his writings are

[1] *Epistle to the Philippians,* xiii.

everywhere saturated with New Testament language and thought.

2. *During the Period of the Early Apologists* (*ca.* 120-170 *A.D.*).

It was really during the struggle with Gnosticism that the New Testament canon began formidably to take shape. In the reign of Hadrian (117-138 A.D.) Bassilides, a teacher and defender of the true faith, combated the antinomian views of the Gnostics, by appealing to Matthew, Luke, and John, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians, as "scripture."

But the first apologist actually to place the great majority of the New Testament writings definitely on a level with those of the Old Testament was Justin Martyr.[2] He wrote two *Apologies* and a *Dialogue with Trypho*. Of all the apologists who rallied to the defence of Christianity, he is by far the most important witness to the writings of the New Testament. In his *Apologies,* which were written probably between 140 and 150 A.D., he speaks of "Memoirs of the Apostles called Gospels," as being read at his time in the churches, interchangeably with the Prophets. By Professor Lake this is regarded as "the first step in the actual formation of the New Testament canon."[3] Justin Martyr

---

[2] Born in Shechem ca. 100; died a martyr in Rome 165 A.D.

[3] Art., "Canon of New Testament," *A New Standard Bible Dictionary* (Revised Edition), p. 612.

seems to have been acquainted with not only the four gospels, but also the book of Acts, and at least six of the Pauline Epistles together with the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1 John, and Revelation. For the preaching of the Apostles he had a very high regard: he says, "By the power of God they proclaimed to every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach to all the word of God." [4] It is not, however, to be supposed that he regarded their sermons as *ipso facto* canonical "scripture." Papias of Hierapolis, likewise, a contemporary of Justin Martyr, though he was acquainted with documents bearing the names of Matthew and Mark, and also other books of the New Testament, nevertheless left them all uncanonized.

But the most celebrated of the Gnostic heretics is really our best witness to the growth of the New Testament canon during this apologetic age: we refer to Marcion, a native of Pontus, who migrated to Rome, but eventually broke with the Roman church (ca. 140 A.D.). He ventured to form a canon of his own, consisting of the Gospel of Luke and ten of Paul's epistles; all the other books of the New Testament he rejected. Marcion is of paramount importance, nevertheless, because he gives us the first clear evidence of the canonical standing of Paul's epistles. For, as is evident, his rejection of the Pastorals only shows that they had already been accepted. The great majority of New Testa-

[4] *Apologies*, 1, 39, 66.

ment books are known to have been in existence. Marcion's recognition of some and rejection of others, he being a heretic, naturally insures the canonicity of them prior to 150 A.D., even more certainly than though he had been an ally of the orthodox faith.

3. *The Continued Growth of the New Testament Canon (ca. 160-200 A.D.).*

The second half of the second century was a period of both canon and creed making. In describing it, Dr. Casper Rene Gregory treats of it under the caption "The Age of Irenæus." [5] Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, quite possibly in the city of Smyrna (ca. 135 A.D.), and was a pupil of Polycarp, who in turn was a disciple of John the Apostle. He migrated to Rome, and there became famous as a great teacher and defender of the faith. He frequently appealed to the various writings of the New Testament for authority, making special use of the four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of Paul, several of the Catholic Epistles, and the book of Revelation. All these he regarded as authoritative in the fullest canonical sense and as equal in every respect to the writings of the Old Testament. He is said to have made more than two hundred quotations from Paul's letters alone, showing that he regarded them as technical "scripture." Irenæus died as bishop of Lyons in France.

[5] *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (pp. 111-217).

With like reverence, Clement of Alexandria (ca. 190) and Tertullian of Carthage (ca. 200 A.D.) spoke of the New Testament books. Alongside "the Law and the Prophets" of the Old Testament they placed "the Gospel and the Apostles" as a worthy counterpart. This sentiment prevailed, with growing conviction, throughout the church during the whole struggle of pure Christianity with Montanism, until it gave birth to a new title by which to designate the new documents called Christian, namely, that of the "New Testament." This new designation of the writings which the Fathers held as authoritative became in due time popular, chiefly through the influence of Origen, who lived from 189 till 254 A.D.

Near the end of the second century, a list of "New Testament" books appeared in a document, supposed by many to have been the work of Hippolytus, known as the "Muratorian Fragment." [6] It is of special importance because it furnishes an almost complete list of all the New Testament books now included in our Christian Canon. However, the list as discovered is not absolutely complete, and so has come to be known as a "fragment." For example, Matthew is omitted, though clearly implied; so also the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, and James; indeed, altogether, seven of the books which now constitute our New Testament seem to be still strug-

[6] So called because discovery in 1740 by Muratori, the Librarian of Milan.

gling for admission. The book of Revelation was, as we know, long rejected by both the Syrian and Palestinian churches; the Church of Egypt doubting for a long while some of the Catholic Epistles. By the close of the second century, however, there seems little doubt but that the four Gospels were firmly established in the West; in Africa, also, not only the Gospels, but the apostolic writings, including the Acts, and the thirteen Epistles of Paul.[7] In short, as Professor Lake concludes, "By the close of the second century, the New Testament canon was fairly well established, with a fourfold Gospel, a collection of Pauline Epistles, and a less closely defined body of other apostolic writings, as to which local opinion varied."

4. *The Completion of the New Testament Canon* (200-400 A.D.).

There seems to have been a strong tendency in the West during the second and third centuries A.D., to *read* other than recognized canonical books in public worship, and, because they possessed certain ethical merits, to include them in the inspired New Testament canon. For example, the Claromontane canon found in Codex D, gives among others "The

[7] Among those rejected were "The Gospel of the Egyptians," which had been used by Clement of Alexandria (ca. 190 A.D.), and the "Harmony of the Gospels" by Tatian, which were introduced into the Syrian Church about the end of the second century. Besides these, the Syrian Church seems to have recognized certain spurious letters connected with Corinth, which are still preserved to us in the Armenian New Testament.

Shepherd of Hermas," "The Apocalypse of Peter," and "The Acts of Paul." But the great counteracting positive witness to the true canon during the third century was Origen. He was born in Alexandria ca. 185 A.D., and died ca. 254. Being a celebrated Bible expounder, he was recognized on all sides as peculiarly well acquainted with Bible canonics, and in particular with what the limits of the New Testament canon ought to be. He divided the books of the New Testament into three classes: genuine, rejected, and doubtful. He himself accepted the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and Acts, without hesitation. In accepting Hebrews, however, its authorship troubled him, and though he left its origin uncertain, saying, "God alone knows who wrote it," he nevertheless accepted of it as "scripture." He likewise accepted of the Apocalypse of St. John, referring to and citing it "as John the son of Zebedee says in the Revelation." But he hesitated to include the epistles of Jude, James, 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John as integral parts of the New Testament canon. These he classified as "doubtful." On the other hand, he was personally willing to accept "The Shepherd of Hermas" as "scripture," but he realized that many of his contemporaries did not. "The Gospel of the Egyptians" he explicitly rejected!

Eusebius, who lived from ca. 270-340 A.D., and was for many years bishop of Cæsarea, is another outstanding witness to the completion of the New

Testament canon. He flourished during the great persecution which took place in Palestine in the early part of the fourth century, when not only churches were burned, but the scriptures of the Christians were consigned to the flames in the public market places. This was during the reign of Diocletian, when the Roman government was trying to destroy the church by burning all its sacred books. The Government officials were wont to force those in charge of Christian churches to give up their sacred books to be destroyed. For the custodians of the sacred writings to do so, however, was to incur the guilt of the most serious apostacy, a well-nigh unpardonable sin. Those doing so were called traitors!

Eusebius, in his *Church History,*[8] gives a catalogue of the Christian Scriptures dividing the New Testament writings into two groups: in the first, the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul, including Hebrews, 1 John, 1 Peter, and with some hesitation the book of Revelation; in the second group he placed those books which had received but partial recognition, namely, James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, though he allowed that many recognized them. From all this, it is evident that Eusebius' list does not differ substantially from that of Origen.

Finally, Athanasius (d. 365 A.D.), in one of his pastoral letters gives a list of twenty-seven books,

[8] Book III, Chap. 25.

the exact number and the same books which the entire Christian Church, Roman Catholic and Protestant, now recognize as canonical. These twenty-seven, he says, are "the wells of salvation"; and he adds, "Let no one add to these; and let nothing be taken away." [9] The Councils of Hippo and Carthage in 393 and 397 A.D., respectively, under the influence of Augustine, passed an edict to the effect that these twenty-seven books are the oracles of God and the charter of the Christian faith. Pope Gelasius (492-496 A.D.) finally and officially confirmed the decree of these Councils by one of his own to the same effect, and all further discussion of the question ceased.[10] Ever after, the Western Church has had just twenty-seven books in their New Testament, no more and no less.

And so, for Christians, the New Testament books, without superseding or in any sense supplanting those of the Old Testament, took their place beside those of the Old, thus completing the revelation which God had already entrusted to his chosen people Israel.[11]

---

[9] Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 390 A.D.) published a similar list, but omitted Revelation. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386 A.D.) did the same. Some of the Catholic Epistles were disputed for a long time. Revelation, also, was long doubted by the Palestinian and Syrian Churches; but Athanasius' list helped immensely to give them canonical standing.

[10] *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis.*

[11] Cf. E. T. Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church,* p. 13.

VIII

THE ANCIENT VERSIONS

1. *The Greek Septuagint.*

Of all the ancient versions of scripture which have come down to us, the translation of the Old Testament into Greek is by far the most important. It is known as "the Septuagint," or "Alexandrian Version," and is often designated by the sign "LXX." For some six centuries after its first appearance, it was the Bible of the Hellenistic Jews, not only in Egypt and Palestine, but throughout Western Asia and Europe, and was universally praised by the Fathers of the Early Greek Church. It has been appropriately called "the viaduct between the Old and New Testament, the vestibule of the Christian Church, and the bond of union between Jews and Gentiles." [1] It was the Bible of Jesus.

(1) *Its Origin* is obscure. According to an acknowledged "literary fiction," known as the "Letter of Aristeas," the royal librarian, Demetrius Phalereus, at Alexandria convinced king Ptolemy Philadelphus of the importance of securing for his

[1] Grinfield, *Apology for the Septuagint,* 1850.

library (consisting already of "more than twenty myriads of books") a translation of the Jewish Law, and in order to propitiate the nation from whom he was asking the favour suggested that the king liberate all Jewish slaves in Egypt; which he did.[2] To Ptolemy's request Eleazar the high priest at Jerusalem responded graciously and forthwith despatched to Alexandria seventy (more correctly, seventy-two) elders, proficient in the Law, six from each tribe, to undertake the task. Whether the king's motive was merely literary interest, or was due to the wants of the Synagogue in Alexandria, is unknown; but, it must have been a powerful and popular motive, as there was no precedent in the world's history for the translating of writings on so extensive a scale.[3]

Upon the arrival of the seventy-two elders from Jerusalem, they were banqueted, according to the story, and then escorted by the royal librarian to the island of Pharos, near Alexandria, where in thirty-six cells, two in each, they executed their task in the miraculously short period of exactly seventy-two days! When they had finished, Demetrius the libra-

[2] Ptolemy Philadelphus reigned from 285-247 B.C.

[3] When the work of translation was actually begun is not known: some say in the *second* year of Philadelphus, others the *seventh,* still others the *seventeenth, nineteenth,* or *twentieth.* As to the exact *day* on which they began work, the early Jews named the *eighth* of the month, Tebet, which Rabbinical Jews ever afterwards called "the fast of darkness," because they regarded that day as a national disaster, "like the day on which the golden calf was made" (cf. Margoliouth, *Expositor,* 1900, pp. 348f.).

rian read the translation aloud to the king, who expressed great admiration for it and directed that it should be preserved with scrupulous care. Philo confirms the tradition of Aristeas.[4] He also tells of the inspiration of the translators and the miraculous agreement of their separate manuscripts. He says: "They prophesied like men possessed, not one in one way and one in another, but all producing the same words and phrases as though some unseen prompter were at the ears of each." Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Augustine amplified Jewish tradition by adding that the translators worked independently in separate cells, and produced identical versions, Ptolemy having stipulated this as a test of their trustworthiness. Epiphanius (d. 403 A.D.) adds still another variation to the fiction, saying that the translators were locked up in sky-lighted cells in pairs with attendants and shorthand writers, that each pair was entrusted with one book, the books were then circulated and thirty-six identical versions of the whole Bible, both canonical and apocryphal, were produced. To Philo, Irenæus, and others, the miraculous agreement of the translators proved them to have been inspired no less than the original authors.[5]

How to sift and evaluate this fictitious story of

---

[4] For large portions of the "Letter of Aristeas" as paraphrased by Josephus, see his *Antiquities,* xii, 2, 1ff.

[5] The Cave-dwellings in the Island of Pharos probably account for the legend of the "cells."

Aristeas is not easy; we need not relegate it as a whole to the realm of fiction. When all the traditions are carefully weighed it may be safely concluded that the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament was actually made in Alexandria from Hebrew rolls brought from Jerusalem at the instigation of Ptolemy Philadelphus; that the Pentateuch was translated first, and that afterwards, perhaps a century later, the other books of the Old Testament were translated; and that it was undertaken primarily to meet the needs of the large Jewish Colony at Alexandria.[6] The work of translating was probably done between 250 and 150 B.C.

The chief value of the Septuagint as a Version is its witness to an older Hebrew text than that of the Hebrew manuscripts which are now known to exist. But before we can reconstruct the Hebrew text which was used by the translators in Alexandria, we shall need to revise and correct the text of the Greek version which has come down to us. For the text of the Septuagint began, soon after its first appearance, to become corrupt, being filled with numberless alternative and variant readings and interpolations. Even before the Christian era many such corruptions had crept in, as Philo testifies.[7] But it was not until the beginning of the second century

---

[6] That translators were imported from Palestine is probably fictitious; cf. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (1900).

[7] Cf. his comment on Gen. 15:15.

that the Jews felt the necessity of correcting the errors which had crept in from both Jewish and Christian sources.

(2) *Three New Greek translations* appeared during the second century: the *first* was that of *Aquila,* a proselyte to Judaism from Pontus, and a pupil of Rabbi Akiba. It may be dated as having originated probably between 155 and 177 A.D. Aquila's translation was the most literal imaginable, slavishly literal, and therefore a most extraordinary production. He attempted to reproduce in Greek every jot and tittle, according to his interpretation of the Hebrew.[8] Origen called Aquila "a slave to the letter." Yet his version became the current one in Greek for centuries, having been sanctioned expressly by Justinian who ordered that no other should be used in the Jewish synagogues; and it is still valued as the beginning of the scientific study of the Hebrew scriptures, being an exact reproduction of the rabbinical text of the second century A.D.[9]

Next in chronological order of the three new Greek translations made during the second century

---

[8] For example, he rendered Gen. 1:1, "In *heading* founded God *with* the heavens and *with* the earth"; the word "heading" being selected because the Hebrew word *bereshith* is derived from a root meaning "head"; while "with" Aquila mistook as a preposition, instead of a sign of the accusative case, which here it is.

[9] Of Aquila's original translation certain palimpsest fragments have been recovered from the Cairo Genizah, and edited by Burkitt (1897) and Taylor (1908).

is that of *Theodotion.* He flourished under Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A.D.), and according to Irenæus was an Ephesian convert to Judaism. His version can hardly be called an independent work; it is more truly a revision of the LXX, on the basis of the Hebrew text. He often filled in great gaps on the basis of the Hebrew, and took the liberty of admitting to the book of Daniel the three apocryphal additions namely, *The History of Susanna, The History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon,* and *The Song of the Three Holy Children,* but he was careful to exclude all the non-canonical books of the Old Testament. The result was that in the Early Church the version of Theodotion displaced the true Septuagint Version in MSS. of the LXX; it being preferred in spite of the frequent transliterations of Hebrew words in Greek letters instead of translations.[10]

The version of *Symmachus* is the third of the new Greek translations made during the second century. Symmachus flourished under Commodus (180-192 A.D.). He was an Ebionite and aimed to give a version in Greek to satisfy the needs of Jewish Christians who were dissatisfied with the old LXX. Says Nestle, "If Aquila is the most important of the three because of his literalness, Symmachus is in many respects the most interesting for his attempt

[10] In 1772 a MS. of Theodotion's version was found in Rome, belonging to the Library of the Chigi family; it is now known as the Codex Chisianus, and dates from the ninth century, or possibly a little later.

to produce good Greek, and for many of his interpretations.[11] Symmachus went even beyond the original LXX in refining away the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament.[12]

(3) *The Septuagint text has had a very complicated history.* Origen, who was by far the greatest Septuagint scholar of antiquity, laboured, during the first half of the third century A.D., to provide the church with the materials for ascertaining the true text and meaning of the Old Testament; collecting all the later variant versions of the LXX into an *opus magnum,* known as the "Hexapla," or six-column edition of the Old Testament. Unfortunately, this stupendous work has not survived except in fragments; having probably perished ca. 638 A.D., when Cæsarea, and the library which housed it, fell into the hands of the Saracens. But, even did we have it, we should not be in possession of "the original Septuagint," but only the text current in Origen's time, plus his emendations.

Three other recensions dating from the first quarter of the fourth century A.D. were in circula-

---

[11] Art., "Septuagint," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* IV, p. 453.

[12] Besides these three new Greek versions of the second century, Origen used three other MSS. in his "Hexapla," naming them *Quinta,* said (by Field) to be "the most elegant of the Greek MSS."; *Sexta,* of Christian origin (as the presence of the word "Jesus" in Heb. 3:13 shows), and *Septima,* of which little is known.

tion in Jerome's day: one was that of Pamphilus and Eusebius, who, in prison in Cæsarea, together revised the Palestinian text; another that of Hesychius and Phileas, both martyr bishops in Egypt, who revised the Alexandrian text; and the other, that of Lucian of Antioch, who, in collaboration with the Hebraist Dorotheus, revised the text on the basis of manuscripts presumably of great antiquity. Lucian's recension is of the highest value. All three recensions date from about the same time (312 A.D.)

(4) The *Value* of the Septuagint version is now manifest from many angles; but it should never be assumed that the text as known to us to-day, through the Codex Sinaiticus, or the Codex Vaticanus, or other less ancient recensions, is exactly that of the original Septuagint dating from ca. 250-150 B.C. The object of the translators was not to make a scholarly translation, but to make the Hebrew text intelligible, *i.e.*, to give the sense rather than the form. It was also intended primarily for popular use in the Synagogues. It was when controversies arose between Jews and Christians, that the former always fell back on the Hebrew, and new Greek translations and recensions came to be made. Besides these patent and more important values of the LXX, it is interesting to know that it was the Septuagint version which first separated Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah into two books each, of more convenient compass. It was the

Septuagint, also, that in general gave us the present order of the books in the Old Testament: for example, the Twelve Minor Prophets to stand last in order rather than Chronicles; and Daniel to be placed along with the "Prophets" instead of among the "Writings."

(5) Among the *daughter* versions of the Septuagint are the "Itala," or Old Latin Version, dating from the second century A.D., the Egyptian or Coptic, the Ethiopic, the Syriac version of Paul, bishop of Tella (ca. 616 A.D.), and the Armenian, besides fragments in Arabic, Gothic, Slavonic, and the Georgian Versions.

2. *The Peshito Version in Syriac.*

According to Nestle, "no branch of the Early Church has done more for the translation of the Bible into their vernacular than the Syriac-speaking. In our European libraries we have Syriac Bible MSS. from the Lebanon, Egypt, Sinai, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Malabar, even from China." [13]

The oldest and by far the most celebrated of all these Syriac versions is known as "the Peshito," which means "the simple" or "easy to be understood." Whether the translation was wholly of Christian origin is unknown. There were many Jews in Mesopotamia, especially in Edessa, in early times, and it is quite possible that the Syriac Version of the

[13] Art., "Syriac Versions," Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible,* IV, p. 645.

Old Testament is of pre-Christian origin. Older scholars were accustomed to speak of the Syriac New Testament as "the Queen" of all Bible versions. When it was actually made no one can tell, but it is the opinion of many that it was done "scarcely later than the latter half of the second century A.D." [14]

The Syriac Old Testament was, on the whole, the same as the Hebrew Bible, and was evidently translated from the Hebrew text of Palestinian Jews. It contains the same number of books as the Hebrew Bible, namely, twenty-two, though arranged in a different order; for example, Job follows the Pentateuch, and the Twelve Minor Prophets stand between Isaiah and Jeremiah, while Daniel closes the Old Testament. The Books of Chronicles seem to have been missing from the oldest MSS., but they were found already present in the MSS. of the sixth century.

The translation of the writings of the New Testament was probably the first translation of them ever made. Whether done in Palestine, or Antioch, or Edessa, which in recent years has found most favour, it makes little difference. Edessa was the literary capital of the Syriac world in those early days of the Christian era. As a translation it is said by those who speak the language to be careful,

---

[14] Burkitt, however, believes that we owe both the production and victorious reception of the Peshito to the organizing energy of the great Rabbula, bishop of Edessa from 411-435 A.D.

faithful, and literal. The simplicity, directness, and transparency of the style are admired by all.

Three other Syriac Versions of the New Testament are supposed to have been made prior to the Peshito, though their dates can not be definitely fixed. These, taken in the chronological order of their recovery, are: (1) the *Curetonian Syriac* MS., consisting of certain fragments of the Gospels, brought in 1842 from the Nitrian Desert in Egypt, and now in the British Musem. This MS. was examined by Canon Cureton of Westminster and found to belong to the fifth century, but the actual text of the MS. belongs probably to the second century; (2) *Tatian's Diatessaron,* the earliest harmony of the Four Gospels known; dated by Nestle ca. 153-170 A.D., having been compiled probably at Rome. Eusebius speaks of Tatian as a "heretic," and says, "he gathered and mixed and composed a Gospel and called it Diatessaron, *i.e., Mixed!*" No copy in Syriac of Tatian's Diatessaron has ever been found; but in 1876 an Arabic recension of it was discovered, which is ascribed to Abdullah ibn at-Tajjib, who died 1043 A.D.[15] (3) The other Syriac Version is the *Sinaitic,* discovered in 1892 by Mrs. Agnes S. Lewis and her sister Mrs. Margaret D. Gibson, in the Monastery of St. Catherine at the base of Mt. Sinai. It is a translation of the Four

[15] An English translation of the Arabic has been made by J. Hamlyn Hill, entitled, *The Earliest Life of Christ ever compiled from the Four Gospels.*

Gospels, only, and is regarded by critics as the oldest translation ever made of the Gospels into Syriac, dating probably from the second century A.D. The MS. is a palimpsest. It is now carefully provided with a silver-mounted casket, richly carved, which naturally remains in the custody of the librarian of the Greek Orthodox monastery at Sinai, where it was found.[16]

3. *The Latin Vulgate.*

The Latin translation of Holy Scripture, which Jerome made from the original Hebrew and Greek in Bethlehem between 390 and 405 A.D. (as revised in 1592) is the international standard Bible Version of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world. The name "Vulgate," which it bears, meaning "currently received," was originally the designation of the Septuagint, but in the course of time this title came to be applied also to the Latin Version of Jerome.[17] This transfer of the title from the Greek to the Latin became possible only when the Latin Version came to mean to the Western

[16] This Sinai palimpsest differs occasionally from the commonly received Greek text: for example, in Matt. 1:16, it reads: "And Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph, to whom was espoused Mary, a virgin, begat Jesus, who is called Christ." But the other great Syriac version, the *Curetonian,* reads as ours: "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." The context of the Sinaitic palimpsest (Matt. 1:18-25) does not really deny, but rather implies the Virgin Birth.

[17] Both Jerome and Augustine speak of the Septuagint as the "Vulgate."

Church what the Greek Version had meant for centuries to the Eastern.[18]

Other Latin versions had already been made, especially in North Africa, as early as 250 A.D., and even earlier, as the citations in Cyprian and Tertullian show; but most of these, including the "Itala," which is the most important of them all, were the work of individual translators who were all quite unequal to their task. In those days, everybody who thought he knew enough Greek ventured to translate. The consequence was that Latin translations so multiplied, and their versions became so divergent, that readers were confused, and the ecclesiastical authorities in Rome began to feel that the Church ought to have, instead of these imperfect and irreconcilable texts, one standard version. Controversies, also, were rising in the Church, which accentuated the need for an authoritative translation.

The one man, who, at that time, seemed alone to be capable of establishing the true and normative text, was Eusebius Hieronymus, or as he is generally known to us, Jerome. He was born of Christian parents at a place called Stridon, on the borders of Dalmatia, ca. 340 A.D. He began his theological studies in Gaul, but subsequently sought the seclusion of ascetic life in the desert near Antioch in Syria.

[18] The Latin Vulgate, indeed, has become in history, directly or indirectly the parent of all the vernacular versions of Western Europe (except the Gothic of Ulfilas); *e.g.*, Wycliffe's (1382) and the Rheims-Douay (1582-1610).

There he studied Hebrew. In 382 A.D. he returned to Rome and became the intimate friend and counsellor of Pope Damasus. The Pope had long been looking for a man who was capable of correcting and revising the rival Latin translations. Accordingly, to Jerome he officially gave the commission of producing an authentic standard Latin version, on the basis of the Greek. Jerome promptly undertook the task, and began by collating all the Greek MSS. possible, and comparing them with the old Latin translations. He then proceeded to revise the Gospels, and the other books of the New Testament; but his work was done very hastily and superficially. He next turned to the Old Testament, and in 384 A.D. had cursorily revised the Psalms, when the Pope died. This first revision of the Psalms is now known as "the Roman Psalter," and is still used in St. Peter's at Rome, and in St. Mark's in Milan. At the request of Paula and Eustochium, he made a second attempt at revising the Psalms, and finished in 387. This version is now known as "the Gallican Psalter," because of its early popularity in Gaul. Like the Roman Psalter it was corrected on the basis of the LXX. The other books of the Old Testament Jerome revised in the same hasty and unsatisfactory manner; the three books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles being, he tells us, revised in three days![19]

[19] Jerome must have been a most rapid, almost phenomenal worker; *e.g.*, it is reported that he wrote his Commentary on Ephesians at the rate of 1000 lines a day!

Through all the eight long years of revision and "patching up" of the old Latin versions, Jerome became more and more dissatisfied with the method of mere revision. Accordingly, about 390 A.D. he yielded to the pleadings of his friends to translate *de novo* the Old Testament from the Hebrew direct.[20] He began with the books of Samuel and Kings, to which he wrote a formal, and for us, exceedingly valuable introduction called the *Prologus galeatus,* or "Helmed Preface." He then proceeded to translate the Psalms (ca. 392), Job and the Prophets (ca. 393), 1 and 2 Esdras (ca. 394) and Chronicles (ca. 396). Through sickness, his labours were at this point interrupted. In ca. 398, however, he translated Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles; by ca. 401 he had finished the Pentateuch, and by 405 had completed the whole Old Testament including Tobit and Judith. The other apocryphal books, however, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and the apocryphal additions to Daniel and Esther, he left untouched, not even revised. Altogether Jerome spent fifteen strenuous years (390-405 A.D.) on his new Latin translation, a

---

[20] Jerome had no peer in scholarship. As Westcott says, "In the crisis of danger when the Eastern and Western churches were separating and perpetuating false and conflicting Latin copies, this great scholar was raised up, who probably alone for fifteen hundred years possessed the qualifications necessary for producing an original version of the Scriptures for the use of the Latin churches." (cf. his Art. entitled "Vulgate" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible,* IV, p. 3459).

translation which was destined to become "a possession for all time."

But Jerome's enterprise, being strictly a private affair, the leaders in the church were slow in recognizing its unquestionable merits. For example, he was accused of having slighted the Septuagint, which even Augustine as well as many others at that time regarded as equally inspired to the Hebrew itself. Besides, North Africa naturally long resisted the right of Jerome's new translation to usurp the place of the Old Latin Versions, which in several instances had had their origin in North Africa. Accordingly, as Jerome's new version had no special sanction, and inasmuch as the Old Latin Versions were not officially set aside, it was forced to compete with the older translations and win its way on its own intrinsic merits. By the end of the fifth century, however, it had become already popular in Gaul, and by the end of the sixth century, it had found its way to the hearts of many even in North Africa, so that Pope Gregory the Great was able to announce that both the old versions and the new translation of Jerome were equally valued by the Apostolic See. This placed the Vulgate on an equal footing at least with the others.

In the seventh century, the text of the new version was already becoming corrupt; Cassidorus undertook to revise it. At the close of the eighth century (802 A.D.) Charlemagne commissioned Alcuin the third abbot of St. Martin of Tours, to revise the

new Latin text on the basis of the best Old Latin manuscrips, without reference to the Greek. Alcuin's revision caused many in the ninth century to produce other new MSS. and versions of their own. Needed correction and revision became more and more apparent. Lanfranc, bishop of Canterbury, in the eleventh century, Stephen Harding of Citeaux and Cardinal Nicolaus in the twelfth, both attempted to correct the text but without any marked success. The existing errors not only persisted, but were carried over into the printed Bible (the Bible in Latin being one of the very first volumes ever issued from a printing press), and into the controversies between Romanists and Protestants. The result was that a standard edition of the Bible became imperative. Accordingly, the Council of Trent in 1546 took up the matter, and decreed that "the same old and ordinarily used text which has been approved in the Church itself by the long usage of so many centuries," should be regarded as the authentic Latin Version. But the Council failed to designate which one of the Latin texts was intended. The members of this historic Council, however, started a stream of influence which eventually issued in securing for the Church a standard edition of the Vulgate, known as the Clementine Edition of 1592.

The history of the official revision which went on during the period between the Council of Trent (1546) and the completion of the Clementine edi-

tion of 1592 is full of instruction.[21] After the decree was passed the Council appointed a Commission to revise the Vulgate and to issue a perfect Latin text. Work was begun promptly but very unmethodically, accompanied by many interruptions. At last, Pope Sixtus V took up the task and threw all his energies into it, reserving the right to correct the final proof sheets as they came from the press. The result was that the text became arbitrarily mixed because of his unscholarly corrections, and when it came out in 1590, it was too defective to be circulated. Nevertheless, in his preparatory bull, as it left his hands (1589), he made it the correct and official text, saying: "By the fulness of apostolic power, we decree and declare that this edition of the sacred Latin Vulgate of the Old and New Testaments, which has been received as authentic by the Council of Trent . . . be received and held as true, legitimate, authentic, and unquestioned, in all public and private disputation, reading, preaching and explanation." [22] Shortly after this, the Pope died. Three successors followed in rapid succession. It was finally left for his fourth successor, Pope Clement VIII, to revise and republish the supposed standard text.

---

[21] Previous to the Council several noteworthy attempts had been made to secure an authentic edition: *e.g.*, the various *"Correctoria Bibliorum"* (1231-40) the *Complutensian Polyglott* (1514ff.), and Robert Stephanus (1528), who made the first attempt at a critical edition, and whose revision practically became the foundation of the official Roman Vulgate in 1592.

[22] Cf. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament,* p. 150.

This he did without delay, and it has ever since been known as "the Clementine edition of 1592." From this official Latin text the Roman Church requires that all vernacular versions in other languages, when called for, shall be made. As Kaulen, a celebrated Roman Catholic authority, says, "This is really the only official text of Roman Catholics. It is authoritative not on account of its inner characteristics, but because of the Church's recognition of it." [23] It is given precedence over all others—even the Hebrew and Greek originals—for the support of doctrine and the guide of life. By this, of course, it is not necessarily implied that in every particular the Vulgate represents the exact text and precise meaning of the original writers, but only that in extent and doctrine it is the authoritative version as opposed to all other *Latin* versions.[24] And yet the language of the decree is so explicit in its final statement that it seems to contain at least a tacit reference to the originals. The decree reads thus: "The Vulgate, which has been approved in the church by the long use of so many centuries, should be held authentic in public reading, controversy, preaching and exposition, and no one should dare to presume to reject it *on any pretext whatever.*" [25]

---

[23] Art, "Vulgata," *Kirchenlexikon,* xii, Col. 1140.

[24] So W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* 2 edit., p. 28.

[25] The words in italics are taken by W. H. Green to allude to the Hebrew and Greek originals; cf. his work entitled, *The Text,* pp. 122ff.

The preface to the Clementine Edition of 1592 was written by the Jesuit, Bellarmin, who by a singularly oblique statement, evades the truth concerning the earlier edition of Pope Sixtus V. He says that errors had crept into the former edition of Pope Sixtus V, through the carelessness of the printers; whereas, as is well known, by far the greatest errors were the deliberate alterations of the Pope himself, and were recognized as such at the time. [26] The differences between the two editions, that of Pope Sixtus (1590) and that of Pope Clement (1592), according to Gigot, the celebrated Roman Catholic authority, number some four thousand.[27] One other historical anachronism must ever be associated with the decree of Trent: namely, that the Council of Trent declared the Vulgate to be the "authentic translation" in 1546, and only after forty-six years' revision did they discover which edition it was, and called it the Clementine Standard Edition (1592)!

---

[26] Cf. Westcott, Art. "Vulgate," Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible,* pp. 3470ff. Bellarmin, who had persuaded Clement VIII to recall the Sixtine edition, asserts that Sixtus had himself determined to recall his edition on account of printers' errors (from which it is remarkably free). Moreover, in order to evade the pains and penalties of the Sixtine Bull, the book was actually published as a *Sixtine edition,* the name of Sixtus being substituted for Clement's on the title page. (cf. Angus, art. "Vulgate," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia,* V, p. 3062).

[27] Cf. his *General Introduction,* pp. 337-338.

IX

ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS STILL EXTANT

Unfortunately not one of the original autograph MSS. of Holy Scripture is known to be in existence at the present time. How perfect or imperfect, therefore, the autograph MSS. may have been when they left the hands of their original authors is a matter of pure speculation. No one knows even the material on which the individual books were first written—whether stone, clay, parchment or papyrus. All are absolutely gone, and the hope of recovering any or all of them is exceedingly slight. But certain ancient *copies* are extant, and while they are not as old as we should like, they are of paramount, almost of priceless worth. We begin with the MSS. of the Old Testament.

I. HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS

Hundreds of Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament are known to exist, their numbers ever increasing as manuscript "cemeteries" connected with old Synagogues in Cairo and the East yield their treasures to searching explorers.

The oldest is one of the *Pentateuch,* supposed to

date from ca. 820-850 A.D. It is written in book form (not as a roll) and is somewhat defective near the end. The consonants are furnished with vowel points and accents. This MS. is now in the British Museum.

The oldest MS., however, *actually bearing a date,* is one of the *Latter Prophets* (*i.e.,* Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve), now in the library of Petrograd. It carries the date of 916 A.D. and is written on vellum, in double columns on each page, the vowels and accents being written above the consonants instead of below, according to the system in Babylon. Portions, however, of the last chapter of Zechariah and of the first chapter of Malachi are left without vowel points!

The oldest MS. of the *whole* Hebrew Bible, bearing a definite record of its age, is dated 1246 A.D. Certain other MSS. are claimed to be older, but it is uncertain as to their exact age: one is the *Codex ben Asher*, now in a Synagogue in Aleppo, claimed to have been written in the tenth century. The others are the Codex Laudianus at Oxford, containing the whole Old Testament except a large part of Genesis, and another containing the Pentateuch, and supposed to belong to the eighth century. More probably it belongs to the tenth.

But whatever their individual dates may be, taking all the Hebrew MSS. together which are now known to be extant, it is agreed by the best authorities that they all seem to point to one single copy as

their foundation head. If this be so, it only shows with what meticulous care the Jews were accustomed to transcribe the text of Scripture. So scrupulous, indeed, were the scribes who did the work of copying, it is said, that they would not change so much as a word, or a letter, even if they found an error in the MS. from which they were copying; rather they would transcribe it exactly as it was written, and then write on the margin of their own MS. what they thought the true reading ought to be. They even counted the verses and letters in each separate book and tabulated them; also, the number of verses in all the books of the Old Testament taken together.[1] Such scrupulous regard for their sacred writings naturally lessened very much the danger of erroneous copying, and makes the Hebrew text as we possess it far more trustworthy than some are willing to allow.

With the invention of printing, naturally, the copying of MSS. by hand became less and less necessary, and in process of time, the science of copying neatly and accurately by hand has gradually been given up. The MS. period, accordingly, may be said to extend, strictly speaking, only from ca. 850-1650 A.D.

Just here it may also be added that the first portion of the Old Testament in Hebrew ever printed was

[1] For example, the *Codex Edinburgensis,* which was discovered in 1911, records that in the *Torah* there are 5842 verses, in the *Prophets,* 9298, and in the *Hagiographa,* 8063.

the Book of Psalms, at Bologna in 1477; and that the first complete Old Testament in Hebrew ever printed appeared in 1488 at Soncino, Italy; both being the work of Jews.

II. GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

Of the MSS. of Holy Scripture in Greek still existing there are said to be several thousand of varying worth. The oldest are known as *Uncials*, because written in capital letters without any division between the words. Three or four in particular of these old, faded-out, and unattractive documents constitute the most ancient and the most precious treasures of the Christian Church, and are therefore of special interest.

1. *Codex Vaticanus*. This is regarded as probably the most ancient of all the Greek MSS. now known to exist. It is designated as Codex "B." In 1448, Pope Nicholas V brought it to Rome where it has lain practically ever since, being guarded assiduously by papal officials in the Vatican Library. Its history is brief: Erasmus in 1533 knew of its existence, but neither he nor any of his successors were permitted to study it. Napoleon brought it temporarily to Paris in 1809, where it was examined by Dr. Hug, who was the first to announce to the world its supreme importance (1810). In 1815 it was restored to the authorities in Rome, becoming quite inaccessible to scholars, till Tischendorf in 1843, after months of delay, was finally allowed to see

it for six hours. Another specialist, named de Muralt in 1844 was likewise given an aggravating glimpse of it for nine hours. The story of how Dr. Tregelles in 1845 was allowed by the authorities (all unconscious to themselves) to secure it page by page through memorizing the text, is a fascinating one. Dr. Tregelles did it. He was permitted to study the MS. continuously for a long time, but not to touch it or to take notes. Indeed, every day as he entered the room where the precious document was guarded, his pockets were searched and pen, paper and ink were taken from him, if he carried such accessories with him. The permission to enter, however, was repeated, until he finally had carried away with him and annotated in his room most of the principal variant readings of this most ancient text. Often, however, in the process, if the papal authorities observed he was becoming too much absorbed in any one section, they would snatch the MS. away from him and direct his attention to another leaf. Eventually they discovered that Tregelles had practically stolen the text, and that the biblical world knew the secrets of their historic MS. Accordingly, Pope Pius IX ordered that it should be photographed and published; and it was, in five volumes which appeared in 1857. But the work was very unsatisfactorily done.

About that time Tischendorf made a third attempt to gain access to and examine it. He succeeded, and later issued the text of the first twenty pages. Finally,

in 1889-90, with papal permission, the entire text was photographed and issued in facsimile, and published so that a copy of the expensive quartos was obtainable by, and is now in the possession of all the principal libraries in the biblical world.

The MS. dates probably from the first half of the fourth century A.D., and contains some 700 leaves. The text is written on the finest vellum, with three columns to the page, and forty-two lines to the column. The parchment itself is ten inches wide by ten and one-half inches high, the leaves being bound together in one thick volume. The language, of course, is Greek throughout, being written in uncial, or capital letters, with no divisions between the words. It contains, or originally did contain, probably, the whole Bible, Old Testament and New, with certain books of the Apocrypha; for example, the LXX translation of the entire Old Testament, except Gen. 1:1-46:28, and Psalms 106-138; the whole New Testament, except the Pastorals, the book of Revelation, and Hebrews 9:4–13:25.[2] There is another omission in the text of the New Testament which is of special critical importance: the last twelve verses of the Gospel according to Mark (16:9-20). Yet, curiously enough, though omitted, a blank space is left for it on the page where it would naturally be expected, showing that the scribe probably knew of its existence, but was undecided whether or not he should copy it. The value of the

[2] First Esdras is included; but 1 and 2 Maccabees are not.

Codex as an ancient witness to the text of the Bible is incalculably great!

2. *Codex Sinaiticus.* The discovery of this ancient MS. by Dr. Tischendorf furnishes another of the most thrilling stories in the history of modern archaeology. Dr. Tischendorf, as soon as he became a private dozent in the University of Leipzig, resolved to devote himself without reserve to the discovery and study of ancient MSS. He travelled extensively and searched in all the famous libraries and monasteries of Europe and of the Near East. Among others he visited in May, 1844, the Monastery of St. Catherine at the base of Mt. Sinai. There in a basketful of old parchments, he found what he himself has called "the pearl of all his researches," the Codex Sinaiticus, which is designated by scholars as Codex "Aleph." Inasmuch as it was intended to be used as kindling for the fire, the monks generously allowed him to take home with him some forty-three sheets of the precious document, which he subsequently studied, identified and published, careful not to announce where he had found them.[3] But the publication of even these few sheets caused great sensation throughout the entire learned world; whereupon, the British Government despatched a scholar to visit the East, and to purchase at almost any price any ancient Greek MSS. he might be able to find. But this agent returned shortly afterwards

[3] These forty-three sheets carried on them parts of Jeremiah and 1 Chronicles, and all of Nehemiah and Esther.

confessing defeat. Accordingly in 1853 Tischendorf made a second visit to Mt. Sinai, hoping to secure the remaining portions of the coveted MS.; but he succeeded in finding only one sheet of Genesis, with about eleven lines, belonging to the original Codex. Fifteen silent years passed, during which Tischendorf did nothing except eventually to enlist the interest of the Emperor, Alexander II of Russia, who in turn commissioned him to return to Sinai at the Government's expense, to continue his search. It was now 1859. Tischendorf returned to the Monastery and remained until he had examined everything within his reach; but all in vain, until the very last evening before his departure, when, while walking with the steward in the gardens of the Monastery, the latter remarked that he had a copy of the LXX in his room which he was wont to read, and invited Tischendorf to come into his quarters and see it. Tischendorf eagerly responded, repairing with him to his cell, where the monk took down a bulky bundle wrapped in red cloth, and laid it on the table. Tischendorf opened the parcel and found to his delight that it was the very MS. for which he had been diligently and patiently searching since 1844. Without betraying unbounded ecstasy over his discovery, he asked permission to take the MS. with him to his room in the Monastery, and there he spent the entire night examining its contents, copying especially the text of the Epistle of Barnabas which he had never before seen.

The Codex was found to contain practically the entire Old and New Testaments, and several of the apocryphal books, including the letter of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and Fourth Maccabees. Like the Codex Vaticanus, however, it omits Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:55-8:11.[4] Being compelled to leave the MS. at the Monastery, Tischendorf returned to Cairo and reported to the Branch Monastery there his discovery, and persuaded the head of the Monastery to send to Sinai to fetch the MS. to Cairo. This was done, and Tischendorf, with certain German assistants, spent much of the summer copying the MS. Meanwhile he prevailed on the authorities of the Monastery to allow him to take the precious document to Leipzig, publish it, and then present it in the name of the Archbishop and Monks of the Monastery to the Russian Emperor. Tischendorf left Cairo in September, 1859, published the MS. as soon as it was possible to do the work thoroughly and accurately, and on November 10, 1862, presented it to the Czar. Since 1869, accordingly, the MS. has found a home in the Imperial Library of Petrograd.

The MS. has 389½ leaves, each leaf being thirteen and one-half inches wide by fourteen and seven-eighths inches in height. There are four columns and forty-eight lines on each page. The columns are correspondingly narrow, and from this fact Gregory infers that the MS. belongs to the age

[4] The Book of Baruch, also, is wanting.

when large books were written on leaves instead of on a roll, and that this was early; "the change from rolls to leaf books being made about the year 300 A.D." [5] Tischendorf's exact date for the Codex Sinaiticus is c. 340 A.D.; and he thinks it possible that it may have been one of the fifty MSS. Constantine ordered copied for the churches of Constantinople in 331 A.D., and which Justinian may have subsequently sent to the Monastery at Sinai which he founded. Dr. Gregory dates it ca. 331 A.D., accordingly, and gives the following reasons for assigning it to this particular time: (1) the parchment, which is fine; (2) the narrowness of the columns; (3) the forms of the letters; (4) the fact that the columns have no large initial letters projecting into the edge; (5) the rarity of the punctuation; (6) the less pure forms in spelling and grammar; (7) the short titles and subscriptions; (8) the "larger chapters" in the gospels are not noted; (9) the epistles of Paul being placed directly after the Gospels; (10) the absence of Mark 16:9-20; (11) the presence of the letter of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, showing that they were still being read in the churches.[6]

The Codex Sinaiticus ranks high among all the MSS. of Holy Scripture extant. For critical value Westcott and Hort regard it as "far better than any of the other MSS. except the Codex Vaticanus";

---

[5] *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*, p. 333.

[6] *Idem*, p. 338.

while Gregory declares that there is "not much choice between the two." All specialists would agree that it is a very expectional document, and the greatest treasure which the Eastern Church possesses.

3. *Codex Alexandrinus*. This MSS. is known as Codex "A," and was the first uncial ever used by the New Testament scholars. It came to light in the year 1627, too late to be used by the King James' revisers in the preparation of the Authorized Version (1611), and to-day is the most important biblical treasure of the British Museum in London. Dr. Gregory thinks "it was probably written in the last half of the fifth century A.D., in Egypt." It was presented to the Patriarch of Alexandria in 1078, and thus won for itself the name "Codex Alexandrinus." According to an Arabic annotation on the first sheet of the four volumes of it as published, it was written "by the hand of Thelca the martyr." More probably it was the work of pious monks in some monastery dedicated to Thelca. It finally found its way to Constantinople and became the possession of the Patriarch Cyril Lucar.

In 1627 the Patriarch sent it, by the hand of the British Ambassador to Turkey, as a present to King James I. But the king died before the Ambassador reached London, and so he formally presented it to his successor, Charles I.

Like the preceding two great Greek Uncials of which we have spoken, it is a MS. of the entire Bible, having 773 leaves, each leaf being ten and

one-quarter inches wide by twelve and three-quarter inches high, with two columns of text on each page.[7] Certain omissions, however, in the text lessen the value of this Codex: namely, from the Old Testament, certain verses from four different parts of Genesis, a little more than one chapter in 1 Samuel, and about thirty psalms; while from the New Testament, all of Matt. 1:1-25:5; John 6:50-8:52, and 2 Cor. 4:13-12:7. By counting the lines and estimating the space which was assigned to the lost portion, John 6:50-8:52, it is clear that no space was left in this MS. for the story of the adulteress in John 7:53-8:11. But the disputed conclusion to Mark (16:9-20) is present.[8]

IV. Codex Ephraemi is the fourth great Greek Uncial MS. of the Bible in order of importance. It is designated as Codex "C". This Codex, with the three already discussed—Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus—"stand forth," as Gregory expresses it, "in the history and work of textual criticism like David's mighty men!" The full name of this MS. is Codex Ephraemi Syri. It is to be found in the National Library of Paris, having been brought from the East to Rome by Johannes Lascaris. After his death it passed into the possession of the Medici family. Early in the sixteenth century, Catherine de Medici, "of evil memory," brought it with her

[7] The Codex Vaticanus, it will be remembered, carries three columns on a page, and the Codex Sinaiticus, four.

[8] One leaf also is missing from the First Epistle of Clement, and two leaves from his Second Epistle.

to Paris, supposing that the only text on it was that of certain sermons of St. Ephraem. The Codex, however, is a palimpsest (*i.e.,* a rescript, or MS. whose original contents have been erased, rubbed off, or washed out, to make room for another text which is written on top of the original text, or, more correctly, between the lines). In the case of the Codex Ephraemi, the original text was that of the Bible; when this became obscure, pale, and faded out, someone washed out the lines of the original writing as best he could, and then upon the same parchment were written some thirty-eight sermons of St. Ephraem. This was done of course solely in order to save the cost of a new parchment.

The original text of Scripture is thought to have been written in Egypt, probably during the fifth century A.D.; while the text of St. Ephraem's sermons was not written until the twelfth century. No one seems to have noticed that two texts were written on this parchment until the end of the seventeenth century, when a student of the Royal Library in Paris, named Pierre Allix, discovered that an older text lay embedded in the MS. underneath the sermons of St. Ephraem. But no progress was made toward the deciphering of the more antique writing until Tischendorf in 1840 turned his attention to it. He, by means of certain chemicals and acids, revealed to all eyes that a Greek version of Scripture underlay the sermons; and he published the text in so far as he found it present in the MS.

Unfortunately, most of the Old Testament leaves were found missing; however, parts of every book of the New Testament are represented except two (2 John and 2 Thessalonians). Only 64 leaves of the Old Testament, and only 145 out of 209 of the New Testament remain extant. The MS. is an uncial, with but one wide column on a page. The pages are nine and one-half inches wide, by twelve and one-quarter inches high, with usually forty-one lines on a page. Being of about the same age as the Codex Alexandrinus, this MS., though only a fragment, is nevertheless of great value, so far as it goes, for textual comparison, and is highly prized.

V. *Codex Beza,* which is also an uncial, remains to be described. It is known as Codex "D", and dates, it is thought, from the sixth century. Beza was the celebrated Frenchman who passed over from France into Switzerland, and became the successor of John Calvin as leader of the Genevan Church. He had procured this MS. from the monastery of St. Irenæus at Lyons, in 1562, and in 1581 presented it to the University Library at Cambridge, England.

It is spoken of as "the oldest known MS. on which two languages are found"; the left-hand page carries the Greek, the right-hand page, the Latin. The MS. is eight inches wide by ten inches high, and contains 409 leaves, with thirty-three lines to the column. The order of the Gospels in it is Matthew, John, Luke, Mark; these and the book of Acts constitute its complete contents.

There is another bilingual MS. which also bears the sign "D". It is the Codex Claromontanus, containing Paul's Epistles. Both MSS. are approximately the same age; both are in Greek and Latin; both belonged to Beza; but Codex Beza is to be found in Cambridge, whereas Codex Claromontanus is in the National Library at Paris. "The MSS. doubtless belonged," Gregory thinks, "together originally." The one complements the other.

III. LATIN MANUSCRIPTS

Two old Latin MSS. extant are worthy of special mention: one is the *Codex Amiatinus* dating it is thought from the early part of the eighth century. It receives its name from Amiata where it long was; to-day it is the pride of the Laurentian Library at Florence, Italy. It is a fine volume and contains the entire Bible. Originally it was written by Ceolfrid, the Abbot of Yarrow in England, and taken by him as a present to Pope Gregory II 716 A.D. It is nineteen and one-half by thirteen and one-half inches in size, the text being in excellent condition, the best, indeed, of the ancient Vulgates. By some it is supposed originally to have grown out of a fragment of the work of Cassiodorus, who once made a serious attempt to revise the current text of Jerome.

The other MS. in Latin which ought to be mentioned is the Codex Fuldensis, containing the whole New Testament, having been written about 540 A.D. Its name comes from Fulda, a town situated between Eisenach and Frankfort-on-the-Main.

ANCIENT BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS STILL IN EXISTENCE

Name	Date	Contents described	Where now	Value
Pentateuch	ca. 820–850 A. D.	Pentateuch only, in Hebrew	British Museum	Primary
Latter Prophets	916	Isa., Jer., Ezek. and XII Prophs., in Heb. Vowels all above the consonants.	Petrograd	Primary
Whole O. T.	1246	Entire O. T. in Hebrew	British Museum	Primary
Codex ben Asher	10 Century	Former & Latter Prophets	Aleppo	Secondary
Laudianus	10 Century	Entire O. T. except Genesis	Oxford	Secondary
Codex Vaticanus (B)	First Half 4 Century	Whole Bible, except Gen. 1:1-46:28; Ps. 106-138; the Pastorals; Rev.; Hebs. 9:4–13:25; Mk. 16:9–20; Jn. 7:55–8:11.	Rome	Oldest & best of all Greek MSS.
Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph)	ca. 330–340	Whole Bible; also Letter of Barnabas & Shepherd of Hermas. Omits Mk. 16:9–20 and John 7:55–8:11.	Petrograd	Most complete of all MSS.

NAME	DATE	CONTENTS DESCRIBED	WHERE NOW	VALUE
Codex Alexandrinus (A)	Latter half of 5 Century	Whole Bible, except 30 psalms; Mt. 1:1–25:5; Jn. 6:50–8:52, and 2 Cor. 4:13–12:6	British Museum	First Uncial MS. ever used by N. T. scholars.
Codex Ephraemi (C)	5 Century	A palimpsest fragment of whole Bible.	Paris	Not always legible.
Codex Beza (D)	6 Century	Bilingual; Greek and Latin. Gospels and Acts only.	Cambridge	First MS. to have in it Jn. 7:55-8:11
Codex Claromontanus (D)	6 Century	Bilingual: Greek and Latin. Paul's Epistles.	Paris	Complements Codex Beza.
Codex Amiatinus	Early 8 Century	Entire Bible in Latin.	Florence	Best MS. of Vulg.
Codex Fuldensis	ca. 540	New Test. in Latin	Fulda	Secondary
Sinai MS. in Syriac	4 or 5 Century	Gospels only; based on a much older text. Omits Mk 16: 9–20	Monastery at Sinai.	Ranked high for Gospels.
Curetonian	5 Century	Gospels only; seriously mutilated, parts of only 51 chapters being extant. But Mk. 16:9–20 is in it.	British Museum.	Secondary

X

ANGLO-SAXON BEGINNINGS

Certain poetical renderings of choice Bible passages into Anglo-Saxon antedate by many years even the earliest translation of the Bible as a whole into English. The conversion of England to the Latin faith naturally was followed by the introduction of the Latin Bible, both the Vulgate of St. Jerome and the still more primitive Old Latin Version.

Among the pioneer Anglo-Saxon translators stands the quaint poet-singer Cædmon who has been called "the Amos of English literature." To the music of his native harp, short passages, in the form of a poetic paraphrase, began to take on a new early English, or more accurately, an Anglo-Saxon dress. Cædmon lived in the last half of the seventh century. He was by birth a common farmer of Northumbria, but he possessed a rare poetic gift, and was encouraged by the head official of the Abbey of Whitby, to use his talent in versifying scripture. This he did, adapting his paraphrases to the music of his harp. Bede in his *Ecclesiastical History* tells of how "others after Cædmon strove to compose poems, but none could vie with him, for he learned not the art of poetry from men, neither of

men, but of God." He sang of the Creation of the world, the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, of the Incarnation and Passion of our Lord, of the Coming of the Holy Spirit, and the Teaching of the Apostles. Through his poetic renderings of the Bible, the common people of England obtained a rudimentary knowledge of the Bible. While Cædmon was singing in the North, Aldhelm, the Abbot of Malmesbury, in the garb of a minstrel, was singing Bible paraphrases in the South. Aldhelm is usually credited with a translation of the Psalms into Anglo-Saxon poetry, but this is by some regarded as insufficiently authenticated. Tradition affirms, however, that it was at his suggestion that Egbert, bishop of Holy Island, translated the Gospels into Anglo-Saxon, a copy of the latter being now in the British Museum.

Contemporaneous with Aldhelm and Egbert flourished the erudite and very celebrated Bede, who is often spoken of as "the Venerable Bede." He was born in 674, and died in 735. As a monk in the monastery of Jarrow, he became deeply versed in classical literature, both Greek and Latin. His writings cover widely separated fields such as those of medicine, astronomy, and rhetoric, even Ecclesiastical History. But the work which interested him the most, and occupied his time up to the very day of his death, was the translating of the Scripture, especially the Gospel according to St. John. Toward the evening of the last day of his earthly life,

having been informed by his amanuensis that there remained still one chapter yet to be translated, Bede bade him to "write quickly," and continued to dictate until a single sentence only remained. Being reminded that one verse still remained untranslated, he rallied strength to finish it, and whispered, "Now it is finished"; and being placed in the attitude of prayer, a few moments later with a "gloria" on his lips, the soul of the dying saint departed. Unfortunately, not even a fragment of his translation is known to be in existence; having probably perished when the Danes laid waste Northumbria.

King Alfred the Great, in the latter half of the ninth century, made a royal contribution toward the translating of the Bible in England. He even prefaced his Laws, which are known as "Alfred's Dooms," with a simple but forcible rendering into Anglo-Saxon of the Ten Commandments. He also translated the Lord's Prayer, some of the Historical Books of the Old Testament, and several of the Psalms. He died in 901.

During the tenth century the Gospels were also translated, the Anglo-Saxon rendering being inscribed between the Latin lines. One MS. which is known as "The Cotton MS.," contains the Latin of the seventh century, and (between the Latin lines) an Anglo-Saxon paraphrase, dating from about 950 A.D. This is sometimes spoken of as "the earliest known version of the Gospels in the English language." It is a word for word rendering of

the Latin original. The Bodleian library at Oxford possesses another interlineated copy of the Gospels, which like "the Cotton MS." is translated from not the Vulgate, but the Old Latin. These MSS. are the most important of all in Anglo-Saxon, and are especially valuable, because they carry us back to the earliest Latin version known, namely, of the second century, A.D.

Besides these, there are six other translations of the Gospels into English, all dating, however, from the tenth century: two in the British Museum, two in the Library at Cambridge, and two in the Bodleian at Oxford. One of the two at Oxford is known by the name of its donor as the "Rushworth" gospels. Near the close of the tenth century, Aelfric, archbishop of Canterbury, made an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Esther, Job, part of the Book of Kings, and the Books of Judith and Maccabees. "With Aelfric ends the story of those isolated and fitful efforts in the field of poetic paraphrase, gloss, and translation, of which evidence has come down to us from ante-Norman times." [1]

[1] H. W. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* 1901, p. 35.

XI

EARLY ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

The Norman Conquest in 1066 A.D., gradually displaced the Anglo-Saxon and substituted in its place Anglo-Norman, or Old English, as the vernacular of the people. This, however, required years for its full accomplishment. A people do not change their language in one year. Not until 1215 did an Augustinian monk named Orm attempt to render any part of the Scriptures into the new dialect. For use in communion services, he translated parts of the Gospels and the Book of Acts into Teutonic-Norman, or Old English, metre. His work, "the Ormulum," has fortunately been preserved to us in a MS. of some 20,000 lines, now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Strictly it is not a translation, but only a paraphrase accompanied by notes.

Others followed Orm's example: for instance, William of Shoreham in Kent, ca. 1320, translated the Psalms. Ten years later, Richard Rolle known as "The Hermit of Hampole" in Yorkshire, also translated the Psalms. These were both literal renderings in prose and paved the way for the far more important work of John Wycliffe.

Wycliffe was born ca. 1320 and died in 1384.

He was "the last of the Schoolmen and the first of the Reformers," being fittingly called "the morning star of the reformation." Born in Yorkshire and educated at Oxford, he became Master of Balliol College, but resigned his post at the age of forty in order to preach and write, and if possible bridge the gulf which at that time separated the Church from the common people. He thus became a reformer and a terror of corruptionists; for, he was regarded "the most holy of all the men of his age." He felt that the surest way to defeat Rome and dispel the ignorance of his time, would be to put the Bible into the hands of the common people. Accordingly, he resolved to render the whole Bible into the dialect of the people; and he did so, content to translate the Latin of the Vulgate. By ca. 1380 he had finished the New Testament, and by ca. 1382 the Old Testament was also ready for publication. Two years later he died. Probably he did not do all the work of translating himself. Indeed, there are reasons for thinking that Nicholas of Hereford translated much of the Old Testament: he was excommunicated by the Church before the work of translation was finished, and as the style shows, Wycliffe finished it. There exists a very marked difference between what is thought to be their respective parts of the translation. That of Nicholas, though scholarly and exact, was often stilted and crassly literal, and represented the dialect of South England; whereas, Wycliffe's was more the language

of the common people of the North. But as a whole Wycliffe's translation did more than any other one thing to create and unify the English language. Under its influence the Norman-French eventually gave way, and English took its place. Both Wycliffe and Nicholas were content, however, to translate the Latin Vulgate, without attempting to correct it on the basis of the Hebrew and Greek originals. The original MS. of Nicholas' translation is still in existence in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

Wycliffe won numerous followers, known as the Lollards, whom he sent out to preach and to teach his Bible. These followers soon discovered the defects and faults of their text-book; and so within a few years after Wycliffe's death a thorough revision of the whole version was undertaken by John Purvey, who speaks of himself, in the Introduction to this edition as "a simple creature." In 1388, however, this "simple creature" issued a revision of such a superior character that it soon took the place of Wycliffe's original translation, and within a century had quite supplanted Wycliffe's original altogether.

Inasmuch as the art of printing was not yet known, and copies of the Wycliffe-Purvey Bible had to be transcribed by hand, the circulation was naturally limited, and the price was correspondingly great. Even down in the fifteenth century, it is related, a single copy sold for $150.00! Foxe reports that a load of hay was once given for the use of the New Testament alone for one day! Opposition was

encountered. Twice over Archbishop Arundel proscribed the reading of it, once in 1408 and again in 1414, but many kept on transcribing it for private use. John of Gaunt especially supported Wycliffe most vigorously in his endeavours to give it wide circulation. Of the one hundred and seventy MSS. of the version now known to be in existence, thirty-three are of the original Wycliffe translation, fifteen of the Old Testament and eighteen of the New; all the rest are of Purvey's revision. Strange to say, even the latter was never printed until 1850, when Forshall and Madden, after twenty years of labour, on the basis of some one hundred and seventy different MSS. issued their monumental work in four quarto volumes.

The Wycliffe-Purvey version has "chapter" but no "verse" divisions. No English Bible ever possessed "verse" divisions till the Genevan Version of 1560. In Wycliffe's the "chapter" divisions are often poor and unsatisfactory, *e.g.*, compare the beginnings of Matt. 10 and 20; Mk. 3 and 9; Lk. 21; Acts 8 and 21; 1 Cor. 11; 2 Cor. 5 and 7. But many of the phrases and idioms invented by Wycliffe and Purvey are reflected in our present English versions, both Authorized and Revised: for example, "straight gate," "make whole," "compass sea and land," "damsel," "peradventure," "son of perdition," "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord," etc.

Here is Wycliffe's translation of the Lord's Prayer as found in Matt. 6:9-13:

"Oure fadir that art in heueves, halwid be thi name, thi kingdom comme to, be thi wille done as in heuen so in erthe; gif to us this day oure breed ouer other substance; and forgeue to us our dettis as we forgeue to oure dettours, and leede us not in to temptacioun but delyuere us fro yuel."

Wycliffe is said to have been a pale, stern, ascetic, old man. Yet he boldly attacked the corruptions of the church and indignantly denounced pardons and indulgences and masses as gigantic frauds. The primate of the Church and also the King and the Pope, were all against him. The monks called him "the organ of the devil," "the enemy of the church," "the storehouse of lies," and "the sink of flattery." He died, smitten with palsy, on the last Sunday of 1384. By the decree of the Council of Constance, some forty years later, his bones were dug up and burned, and their ashes flung into the little river Swift, close by his beloved Lutterworth church.

XII

TYNDALE'S PIONEER ATTEMPT

"The history of our English Bible," says Westcott, begins with the work of Tyndale, and not with that of Wycliffe." [1] Wycliffe, indeed, was the first to translate the Bible into English (1382)—nearly 150 years before Tyndale—but, as we have seen, he used as the basis of his translation the Latin Vulgate. Tyndale, on the other hand, went straight to the originals, the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and the Greek of the New.

Born in an obscure village in Gloucestershire, ca. 1484, he studied at Oxford, and later moved to Cambridge, where he met with Erasmus, the greatest Greek scholar of that day, and through him became imbued with a passion for both learning and religion. In 1522 he accepted a two years' appointment as tutor in the family of Sir John Walsh in Little Sodbury, and while there fell into controversy with a bigoted Catholic who boldly alleged that "We would better be without God's laws than the Pope's"; whereupon Tyndale replied, "I defy the Pope and all his laws; if God spare my life, ere

[1] *The History of the English Bible,* p. 25; cf. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* p. 211.

many years, I will cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the scripture than thou dost." Going to London he hoped there to enlist the interest and support of Bishop Tunstall who was reputed to be a patron of learning; but, like Henry VIII, the Bishop was no patron of reform in religion.[2] A London merchant named Humphrey Monmouth, however, received him kindly and for nearly a year sheltered and encouraged him in the great task he had set himself of translating the Bible into English.

Involuntarily, Tyndale crossed over to Hamburg (1524), and in a few months had translated at least two of the Gospels. Quite possibly, also, while still at Hamburg he visited Luther at Wittenberg. But whether he did or not, in 1525 he removed to Cologne, and was about completing his translation of the New Testament when a priest named Cochlaeus, came from Frankfort (which was growingly Protestant) to Cologne, and was about to publish an attack on Protestantism entitled "The Scourge of Luther," when he learned from his printer, Peter Quentel, that Tyndale was in the act of publishing the New Testament in English. Accordingly, he reported the matter to the Senate of Cologne, and they in turn informed the prelates of London

[2] The intellectual and moral conditions in England at that time were deplorable. Of the 311 clergymen in Gloucester, it is said, 168 were unable to repeat the Ten Commandments, and of these 31 did not know whence or from whom the Ten Commandments came. Forty could not repeat even the Lord's Prayer!

and King Henry VIII. This was in September, 1525. In consternation Tyndale fled to Worms with his precious proof-sheets, not yet corrected. There he found a more congenial atmosphere. In due time his translation of the New Testament was printed, and three thousand copies were at once despatched to England, being smuggled "in cases, in barrels, in bales of cloth, in sacks of flour," and in every other secret way that could be devised; and in spite of the utmost vigilance on the part of Church and government authorities at English ports, many copies arrived and were scattered successfully throughout the country. Vigorous attempts were made by the English clergy to collect and burn the precious volume. For example, on February 11, 1526, a solemn bonfire took place near St. Paul's, and as one of the Cardinals expressed it, "no burnt offering could be better pleasing to God." Bishop Tunstall was completely baffled as the books kept on being imported. At length he besought a London merchant named Augustine Pakington, who frequently visited Antwerp on business, to buy up all the copies he could find across the water, and furnished him the money necessary to do so. Pakington, however, was a friend of all reformers. Instead, he went straight to Tyndale and offered to purchase from him all the remaining copies he still had on hand, advising him at the same time that with the money thus obtained he might issue another and larger edition. Tyndale accepted of Pakington's counsel; and, as the latter

expressed it, "the bishop had the books, Pakington had the thanks, and Tyndale had the money." The result was that multitudes in England cried out against the burning of God's Word by Church authorities!

Tyndale lived to see a part only of his great task completed. For twelve years he remained in Europe involuntarily expatriated; for sixteen months he was incarcerated at Vilvorde (north of Brussels). He was finally strangled and burned at the stake on October 6, 1536; his last prayer being, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes." But before his death he had succeeded in translating and publishing not only the New Testament (1525) but also the Pentateuch (1530), and the Book of Jonah (1531). Besides these, he translated in prison all the books of the Old Testament from Joshua to 2 Chronicles inclusive, which he left in manuscript, and which were afterwards used by Coverdale in completing Tyndale's work (1535).

Naturally, the quality of his translation was ruthlessly impeached by his foes. For example, Sir Thomas More denounced his work as "ignorant, dishonest, and heretical." Bishop Tunstall claimed that he had discovered over two thousand errors in it.[3] Ridley announced (1527) that Tyndale's translation of the New Testament was "accursed and

---

[3] Tyndale, for example, had substituted "congregation" for "church"; "seniors" for "elders" or "priests"; "love" for "charity"; and "repentance" for "do penance"; etc.

damned by the consent of the prelates and learned men, and commanded to be burned.[4]

On the contrary, Tyndale's translation was thorough, scholarly and good. It was built primarily on the Hebrew and Greek originals. He was particularly strong in Greek. Having sat at the feet of Erasmus, the celebrated professor of Greek at Cambridge, he was especially conversant with the original language of the New Testament. He was also unusually proficient in other languages. For example, Hermann Buschius, an eminent scholar and contemporary, is quoted as saying, "Tyndale was so skilled in seven languages (Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English and French) that whichever he spoke you would suppose it was his native tongue. He gives evidence on every page of superior linguistic ability. While he translated the originals, he doubtless consulted, also, the Vulgate, the Latin translation of the New Testament by Erasmus, and the German translation of Luther.

The quality of his work is unimpeachable. His honesty, also, is beyond all suspicion. Writing to his friend in Fryth in 1532, he says, "I call God to record against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus, to give a reckoning of our doings, that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would I this day, if all that is in the earth, whether it be pleasure, honour or riches,

[4] To-day only a single fragment remains of Tyndale's first edition of the New Testament; while of subsequent editions only three, or at most four, can be found.

might be given me." And of his independence as a translator, he says: "I had no man to counterfeit, neither was helped with English of any that had interpreted the same before." As a matter of fact, in his use of English he lifted, as Luther did the German language by his translation, the comparatively new English dialect to a very much higher level than it had ever previously attained, and unified it. Hallam, to be sure, boldly accuses Tyndale of actually translating Luther's version into English, but this is an unwarrantable statement and contrary to fact. Confessedly in his "Notes," or "Glosses," and in his "Prologues" to the different books of the Bible, he made free use of Luther's, but in every case, he passed a scholar's judgment upon every detail of his work, and was faithful to the instincts of a true scholar.[5]

The excellencies of Tyndale's translation are many and often very wonderful. Even the Catholic Geddes concedes, that "in point of perspicacity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom and purity of style, no other English version has as yet surpassed it.[6] Tyndale's translation, so far as he had

---

[5] Tyndale follows Luther most closely in his exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. He also places Hebrews, James, Jude and Revelation in the same order as Luther at the end of the New Testament.

[6] Cf. his *Prospectus for a New Translation,* p. 89; also, *Froude, History of England,* iii, p. 84; Marsh, *Lectures on the English Language,* first series, p. 629 (quoted by Mombert, in his *Handbook of English Versions,* pp. 141, 142); and Milligan, *The English Bible,* pp. 46, 47.

finished it, became the basis of every subsequent revision. Even the revisers of the Anglo-American version of 1881 acknowledge, in their Preface (p. v), that they often went back to Tyndale's renderings in preference to those of the Authorized Version of 1611. Tyndale was original. Here are some of his characteristic renderings: "And the Lorde was with Joseph, and he was a luckie felowe" (Gen. 39:2); "When ye pray, bable not moche" (Mt. 6:7); "I was in the Sprete on a Sondaye" (Rev. 1:10); "Be not as lordes over the parrishes" (1 Pet. 5:3). His gloss on Exod. 32:35 is suggestive: "The Pope's bull slayeth more than Aaron's calf." [7]

[7] Cf. J. Paterson Smyth, *How We Got Our Bible,* pp. 99, 100; also, Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* p. 138.

XIII

PROTESTANT BIBLES IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

1. *Coverdale's Completion of Tyndale's Task* (1535).

Miles Coverdale finished what Tyndale, by his untimely death, left incomplete, publishing the first *printed* edition of the Bible in English ever issued. But Coverdale, not being specially conversant with Hebrew and Greek, was shut up to the German and Latin versions; consequently, it is impossible to class his work as of primary value.[1] He appropriated Tyndale's labours—the New Testament, the Pentateuch, Jonah, and his translation of the books Joshua to 2 Chronicles left in MS., and he himself translated the remaining books of the Old Testament from the German and Latin versions, dedicating the whole to King Henry VIII. In his dedication he avows that he has handled the sacred text honestly, saying, "I make this protestation, having God to record in my conscience that I have neither wrested nor altered so much as one word for the maintenance of any manner of sect, but have with a clear conscience purely and faithfully translated the whole

[1] This defect in the Protestant Version, however, was finally corrected in the Genevan Version of 1560.

out of five sundry interpreters, having only the manifest truth of the scripture before mine eyes." [2] It is pretty generally agreed among scholars that "the five sundry interpreters" to whom he refers were, the Zürich Bible of Zwingli (1529), Luther's, The Vulgate, Pagninus' Latin Bible (1528), and Tyndale's version.

Coverdale's influence upon our Authorized Version is very marked. Next to Tyndale he played the most important part of any in the making of the Protestant Bible. Tyndale's style was rugged and original, virile and scholarly; Coverdale's was melodious and rhythmical, quaint, felicitous and beautifully artistic. Each was the complement of the other. Among the many original renderings which we owe to Coverdale are "Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is nigh (Isa. 55:6); "My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever" (Ps. 73:26); "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish but thou shalt endure: they all shall wax old, as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail" (Ps. 102:25-27). Two other characteristic expressions of Coverdale's golden coinage are, "the pride of

---

[2] Cf. Coverdale's *Remains and Letters*, p. 11; quoted by Westcott in his *History of the English Bible*, p. 62.

life," and "the world passeth away," etc. Nevertheless, though his translation was as a whole beautiful and its language musical, it did not succeed in satisfying either the King, or Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury; so, it failed to secure the King's sanction, and the task of revision was forthwith promptly begun.

2. *Matthew's Version* (1537).

The name "Matthew's" was only a pseudonym; John Rogers, probably, did the work of revision, his name being suppressed, lest it might possibly injure the circulation. Rogers had fallen heir to Tyndale's unpublished MSS.; and Matthew is supposed to have been some wealthy merchant who provided him the money with which to publish the edition. As a translation, it possesses very little independent value, consisting of Tyndale's Pentateuch with certain alterations, his unpublished translation of the Old Testament books from Joshua to 2 Chronicles inclusive, and his translation of the New Testament, Jonah (revised by Coverdale) and the latter's prophetical and poetical books with the Apocrypha. Altogether, it was essentially a transitional work.[3] Yet, though only a composite work of the character described, it was the first version of the English Bible ever to become technically "authorized."

[3] Cf. Newth, *Lectures on Revision*, p. 20; Westcott, *The History of the English Bible*, pp. 73, 183; Milligan, *The English Bible*, p. 62.

Its chief merit is that it presented the earlier texts of Tyndale and Coverdale, respectively, in a combined and more homogeneous form. Archbishop Cranmer declared he preferred it to "any translation heretofore made." It was dedicated to "The most noble and gracious King Henry VIII and Queen Anne"! King Henry in response authorized its sale and use; though only two years prior to this he had proscribed Tyndale's New Testament! Of greatest interest is the fact that Matthew's Bible became the real basis and foundation of all later Protestant versions.[4] Unfortunately many of its marginal "notes" carried with them a controversial sting! In size Matthew's Bible was twelve by eight inches; it was soon to be supplanted by the "Great Bible" which was still larger.[5]

3. *The Great Bible* (1539).

The publication of the "Great Bible," as it came to be called, marked a new epoch in Bible reading. A copy was required to be set up, with the King's authority, in some convenient place in every church in the kingdom. King Henry VIII was in some respects a Protestant; in reality he never ceased to be a Romanist. "His opposition to the Pope was the result of the opposition of the Pope to him. He saw to it that the Bible was first circulated, and then

[4] Cf. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* p. 163; Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* p. 71.

[5] In Matthew's Version, the Song of Solomon is entitled "Solomon's Balades"!

piously burned men to death for believing it in any respect wherein it did not agree with his views. It was rather, therefore, in spite of the dubious aid given by Henry, than in consequence of it, that God's Word was widely circulated and read."[6]

This version owed its origin to the zeal of Thomas Crumwell, Earl of Essex, at that time the chief minister of Henry VIII, who, it seems, invited Coverdale to undertake a revised translation on the basis of Matthew's Bible, but with a more systematic collection of the Hebrew and Greek originals than had previously been attempted.[7] Coverdale responded, and describes his mode of procedure thus: "We follow," he writes, "not only a standing text of the Hebrews, with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek; but we set also on a private table the diversity of readings of all texts." [8] This revision became the "authorized" version of common use for the next twenty-eight years, and strictly speaking still remains the only "authorized" version which Protestants possess, as there is absolutely no historical proof that the King James Version of 1611 was ever formally authorized by either Church or State. It was published in April, 1539, and was "authorized to be used and frequented

[6] Cf. Krauth, *Bible Revision,* pp. 27, 28; Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* p. 224.

[7] Cf. S. R. Driver, *The Parallel Psalter,* p. xii.

[8] Including probably Münster's new Latin Version of the Old Testament (1534-35), and Erasmus' Latin Version of the New Testament.

in every church in the Kingdom." Seven editions were issued in rapid succession; all except the first having a preface by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, therefore, sometimes spoken of as "Cranmer's Bibles.[9] It is perhaps not generally known that the psalter of this version is still in use, having been incorporated, on account of its charming rhythm, in the Prayerbook of the Church of England (1662) in preference to the then new version of King James (1611).[10]

The text, though claimed to be "brought into a more faithful relation to the Hebrew and Latin texts by the help of the Complutensian Polyglot," is far from being accurate. Insertions from the Vulgate, which are no part of the original, are frequently retained, only printed in smaller type, *e.g.*, the celebrated passage in 1 John 5:7,8, which the Revised Versions of 1881 and 1900 have omitted altogether. To Psalm 14, three whole verses are added with a view apparently of bringing the Psalm into harmony with the quotation in Rom. 3:10-18.[11] In Psalm 118:26b, instead of the ordinary translation with which all are familiar, "We

[9] The first edition appeared in April, 1539, as already stated; three more were issued in April, July, and November, respectively, of 1540; and three again in May, November, and December, of 1541.

[10] The selection from the Psalms in the "Comfortable Words" of the Anglican "Communion Service" are, according to many, also taken with little change from the Great Bible.

[11] For other additions to the text of the Great Bible, cf. Acts 15:34-41; James 5:3; 1 Tim. 4:13.

have blessed you out of the house of the Lord," the Great Bible translates, "We have wished you good luck, ye that are of the house of the Lord"! Such beautiful phrases and expressions as "paths of righteous," "through the valley of the shadow," and "I will dwell in the house" (Psalm 23), as also "born from above" (John 3:3) and "scapegoat" (Lev. 16:8), are all inherited from the Great Bible.[12]

This version was printed in large folio, and black type, without notes, and without dedication. In size it was fifteen by nine inches, and was the acme of the printer's art, "the very prodigy of typography," at that time. The frontispiece, which is an engraving depicting the absolute authority which Christ the Supreme Head of the Church was conceived of as wielding, is said to have been designed by Hans Holbein. The specially illumined copy on vellum which was prepared in honour of Crumwell, "the indefatigable reviser," and which was presented to him in 1539, is among the chief treasures of the library of St. John's College, Cambridge.[13]

4. *The Genevan Version* (1560).

Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, and the Great Bible all belong to the reign of Henry VIII, the re-

---

[12] Cf. Milligan, *The English Bible*, p. 69.

[13] There was another revision of the English Bible, known as the Tavener Version, which appeared in 1539, but inasmuch as it was little more than a revision of Matthew's version, by a layman, who leaned upon the Vulgate, it never influenced to any

sult practically of the labours of but two men, Tyndale and Coverdale. The next step in the process of producing the Protestant Bible was that taken by a group of exiles, who, during the persecutions of "Bloody Mary," fled to Geneva, and there, under the influence of John Calvin, re-translated the Bible into English from the originals throughout. Not, however, that it was independent of the English Versions already in use, for it is essentially a revision rather than an entirely new translation; but, that the prophetical and poetical books, which Coverdale had originally translated in 1535 from the Latin and the German were now rigorously revised and made to conform to the original Hebrew. The changes in these Old Testament books made by the Genevan revisers are especially numerous.

It is interesting to note just here that during the twenty years between the publication of the Great Bible (1539) and the Genevan (1560) many significant events in the biblical world happened: *e.g.*, the Council of Trent sat for the first time in 1545; Luther died in 1546; Bibles and Testaments by thousands were burned in England by ecclesiastics in the same year; Henry VIII died in 1547; Edward VI, who succeeded to the English throne, died

---

appreciable extent the later Protestant revisions. Tavener, however, attempted to modify and eliminate many of the violent and polemical "notes" of Matthew's. Only two editions of it ever appeared. Yet, to Tavener we owe such happy synonyms and expressions as "parable" for "similitude," "the love of many shall wax cold," "the Israel of God," and others. The Great Bible having received royal authority, Tavener's was soon forgotten.

in 1553; Mary was crowned three months later, and married Philip II of Spain in 1554; Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and some 300 others were martyred in 1555-58; upon Mary's death in 1558 Elizabeth succeeded; Parker was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559; Protestantism became established in Scotland in 1560, the year the Genevan version appeared!

The Genevan Version was born of the Marian terror. The Protestants betook themselves to the more congenial atmosphere of "the holy city of the Alps," Geneva, the cradle of the Reformed faith. Miles Coverdale then resided in Geneva, being seventy years of age. John Calvin had also migrated from Paris. Everywhere, even in Geneva, jealousies, feuds and factions were in the air. To Calvin were committed the highest interests of the city. As one has expressed it, "He became the saviour of Geneva, and Geneva was the saviour of the Reformation"![14] His assistance in the re-translation of the Protestant English Bible was of paramount value.

The New Testament was finished and published first (1557). Who issued it is not known for certain, but the facts point in the direction of William Whittingham, who was related to Calvin by marriage, and later became Dean of Durham. The whole Bible was published in 1560. Those who among others had a part in its production were Knox, Coverdale, Gilby of Cambridge, Dean Sampson of Chichester, and Calvin.

---

[14] Cf. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* pp. 191-193.

The Genevan Version is sometimes spoken of as the "Breeches Bible," from its rendering of Gen. 3:7, which reads, "and they sewed figge tree leaves together, and made themselves breeches" (instead of "aprons")![15] The attitude of Calvin and his Geneva associates toward all forms of recreation and amusement, is reflected in the heading above Mark's account of the murder of John the Baptist (chap. 6), namely, "the inconvenience of dancing"! One new feature peculiar to this Genevan Bible was the division of the text into "verses," which appeared for the first time in Whittingham's edition of the New Testament (1557). He is known to have followed in this the Greek Testament of Robert Stephens, who is said to have divided the text into verses, for purposes of reference and citation, on a journey from Paris to Lyons![16] Other superior features of the Genevan Version were its clear Roman type in lieu of the heavy black letters of previous versions, the employment of *italics* to mark words not represented in the original Hebrew and Greek (an unfortunate innovation, however, because so often misunderstood!), its omission of the Apocrypha, and, also, of the name St. Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but especially its

---

[15] This rendering, however, is not peculiar to this Version of the English Bible: it was Wycliffe's originally.

[16] The Bible text was divided into "chapters" during the thirteenth century, either by Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, or by Cardinal Hugo de Sancto Caro, a Dominican monk.

terse and vigorous style, its literal yet idiomatic language, and its superior accuracy.

Still another feature was the fact that it left behind for the most part the "notes" which for years had exasperated Roman Catholics, and only widened the chasm between them and Protestants. This version was made exceptionally free from all offensive epithets and innuendoes, and, therefore, in stricter keeping with the professed motives of the translators, who alleged: "We may with good conscience protest that we have in every point and word, according to the measure of that knowledge which it pleased Almighty God to give us, faithfully rendered the text, and in all hard places most sincerely expounded the same. For God is our witness that we have by all means endeavoured to set forth the purity of the word and right sense of the Holy Ghost for the edifying of the brethren in faith and charity." [17]

The Geneva Version was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. Two years and more had been spent upon the task. For the Old Testament the Great Bible served as a basis in English; for the New, Tyndale's, with Beza's revised Greek text. Though never sanctioned formally by either Church or State, the Genevan Version became the household Bible of the Protestants of England, and especially of Scotland. Of this version Bishop Wescott remarks: "It is the

---

[17] Cf. Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 96, 220; Milligan, *The English Bible,* pp. 82ff.

most important revision which our English Bible underwent before the settlement of the received text." [18] It was the Bible of the Puritans. It passed through no fewer than one hundred and sixty editions in all, sixty of them during the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1559-1603); and was issued as late as 1644, *i.e.,* thirty-three years after the appearance of our "Authorized Version"! This fact is significant! It was the product, not of one individual with two or three assistants, but of a group of earnest capable revisers.

Among the many valuable expressions which we have inherited from the Genevan Version are, "At the name of Jesus Christ every knee shall bow"; and "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth." [19]

5. *The Bishops' Bible* (1568).

For many Anglicans the Genevan Version was too Calvinistic; at the same time it became more and more evident that the Great Bible was no longer able to hold its place alongside of the new version which was confessedly more accurate. Accordingly, in 1563, Archbishop Parker of Canterbury took steps to have the old version of the Great Bible revised. He designated certain bishops, among whom were Sandys of Worcester, Guest of Rochester, Cox

---

[18] *The History of the English Bible,* p. 220.

[19] For others, cf. Milligan, *The English Bible,* p. 84.

of Ely, and Parkhurst of Norwich, nine in all, and apportioned to them the work. Four years they laboured, and returned with their assignments completed; and after a superficial review of them by the Archbishop they were edited and printed without dedication (1568). Having been for the most part at least, the work of bishops, it was known as the Bishops' Bible. But the simple title was "The Holie Bible, containing the Old Testament and the New." On the title page there was printed a portrait of the Queen. The Archbishop wrote for it a special preface; but Cranmer's preface to the Great Bible also followed.

As a revision it was based upon the Hebrew and Greek originals, but the bishops were especially charged "to set great store by the Latin Versions of Münster and Pagninus"! They were also cautioned to avoid all bitter and controversial "notes," and to mark off, so that the reader might easily leave them out, passages containing matter, such as genealogies, that did not tend to edification. Euphemisms were also to be employed when necessary, so as not to offend good taste. The Apocrypha was taken almost bodily from the Great Bible, without revision.

Though the Archbishop presented a copy to the Queen and wrote in it a private dedication to Her Majesty, there is no evidence that she took any notice of the gift, or that she ever gave the version her formal sanction and authority. His design had been to secure a uniform text for public use, to re-

move all errors, and to produce a popular, not a literary version. But it was soon recognized that the work of the bishops was of very unequal merit. They were all pioneers, and worked independently in isolation. When, accordingly, their work was done and their several portions placed together without any adequate editorial supervision, the whole was but a cento of unrelated, heterogeneous elements, more or less unsatisfactory to themselves as well as to others. In general, they adhered too closely to the text of the Great Bible. Consequently, the new version did little more than supplant the Great Bible; it was not able to compete with the Genevan.[20] The division of the text into "verses" followed also that of the Genevan. It satisfied neither scholars nor the general public. Its imposing appearance did not atone for its defects. It was both costly and cumbersome. In all only nineteen editions were ever issued, the latest appearing in 1606. During the same period more than one hundred editions of the Genevan were demanded. Nevertheless, the second edition of the Bishops' Bible which appeared in 1572, was used as the immediate basis of the King James Version of 1611. Both were the product of the Church of England.

Certain quaint and oftentimes felicitous expressions have come down to us from the Bishops' Version: such as, "Rend your hearts and not your garments" (Joel 2:13); "the middle wall of par-

[20] So Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible*, p. 204.

tition" (Eph. 2:14); "less than the least of all the saints" (Eph. 3:8); "now we call the proud happy" (Mal. 3:15); and "he that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed" (Prov. 22:9).[21]

---

[21] Cf. Newth, *Lectures on Revision,* p. 33; Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions,* p. 275; Milligan, *The English Bible,* p. 97. The illustrations of the Bishops' Bible in some cases brought upon it only reproach: *e.g.,* one edition was called the "Leda" Bible, because of the objectionable picture of "Leda and the Swan," which prefaced the Epistle to the Hebrews!

XIV

THE RHEIMS-DOUAY VERSION

Exactly two hundred years after Wycliffe had given the Bible in English to his countrymen, the Church of Rome translated and published their first English New Testament (1582). Twenty-eight years later they issued in two volumes the Old Testament (1609-10). It came about thus: Certain English Romanists, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign were compelled to take refuge on the Continent. Among them was William Allen of Oxford, who established in 1568 a seminary at Douay, some hundred miles north of Paris, then in Flanders. Ten years later, because of political troubles, the seminary was moved to Rheims, about fifty miles northeast of Paris. There Allen and certain learned colleagues translated the whole Bible into English. Their means being limited, they were able to publish at that time only the New Testament, which, accordingly, is know as the Rhemish Testament. In 1593, they were permitted to return to Douay, and a few years later, finding it financially possible, they published in two volumes the Old Testament (1609-10).

Their chief motive in doing so, they tell us, was to counteract the poisonous effect of the Protestant versions which, from their point of view, were full of alterations and corruptions, and, to oppose a Catholic version to heretical ones.[1] They chose the Latin Vulgate as the basis of their translation, giving in the Preface to the New Testament ten reasons for preferring it to the Hebrew and Greek originals; not one of which, nor all of them taken together, however, are sufficient to justify setting aside the original languages of scripture.[2] What edition of the Vulgate was actually employed in the translation, no one would venture to say. The Standard Clementine Edition of 1592 could not have been used, for it did not appear till ten years after the Rhemish Testament was published. This is a noteworthy fact. The Old Testament, however, is claimed to have been conformed to "the most perfect Latin edition," which possibly it was. But, as a matter of fact, the Rheims New Testament cannot be said to have agreed in

[1] Cf. Gigot, *General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures,* 1903, p. 347; also, their own *Preface to the Rheims New Testament,* of 1582, and that to the *Old Testament* of 1609-10; also, Cardinal Newman's *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical,* pp. 407, 408.

[2] The ten reasons were briefly: (1) Because the Vulgate is ancient; (2) and was corrected by Jerome, *according to the Greek;* (3) and was commended by Augustine; (4) and already long used by the church; (5) and declared authentic by the Council of Trent; (6) and was the most majestic and least partial; (7) and the most exact, *according to the Greek;* (8) and was even preferred by Beza; (9) and other versions were so diverse; (10) and is better than all Latin versions, *even the Greek itself!*

its first edition either with the Vulgate edition of Pope Sixtus V (1590), or with that of Pope Clement VIII (1592).[3]

The most conspicuous merits of the Rheims-Douay version are these: (1) Its classic vocabulary. Through its influence, our religious vocabulary has been enriched by such words as evangelize, remission, grace, confession, impenitent, allegory, advent, emulation, eternity, penance, sacrament, glory, communion, elements, conversion, justification, discipline, propitiations, and many others.[4] (2) The uniformity of its renderings. Compared with the King James Version in this regard, the Rheims-Douay deserves the highest commendation. Usually the same English terms are uniformly employed to represent the English equivalent of any given word in the original.[5] (3) The servile adherence of the Rhemists to the text of the Vulgate. This carries with it certain critical advantages: the original order of the Greek, which lies behind the Latin versions used, is thereby frequently preserved, and inasmuch

---

[3] The editors say: "We binde not ourselves to the pointes of any one copie, print, or edition of the vulgar Latin in places of no controversie, but follow the printing most agreeable to the Greeke and to the Fathers' commentaries" *(Preface to the New Testament)*. Cf. Thos. J. Butler, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* July, 1900, p. 34. Bishop Westcott suggests that they used the Vulgate edition of Hentenius *(The History of the English Bible,* p. 258).

[4] Cf. Newth, *Lectures on Bible Revision,* p. 34; Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 260-265.

[5] Cf. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* p. 210; Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Version of the Bible,* p. 307.

as the translation was made from Latin MSS. anterior to the *official* Standard Clementine edition of 1592, "it points in several cases to Latin readings no longer found in our editions of the Latin Vulgate." [6] (4) Their constant recourse to the Greek when the Latin failed to bring out, for example, the full force of the definite or indefinite article. This lent accuracy to their translation, and in some cases made it more correct, in this particular respect, than the Protestant Versions.[7]

On the other hand, grave defects exist in the original Rheims-Douay Bible: (1) The fact that as a version it is only secondary: *i.e.,* mediate rather than immediate; at best, only a translation of a translation. It consequently possesses the minimum of critical value. For, as Gigot himself admits, "Any version made from another can hardly ever supply readings of greater value in Textual Criticism than those of the translation from which it is derived.[8] A portrait, which is but a copy of a copy, will very probably be wanting in many of the essential char-

---

[6] Cf. Gigot, *General Introduction,* pp. 348-349. The translators say explicitly: "Moreover, we presume not to modify the speeches or phrases, but religiously keep them word for word and point for point, for fear of missing or restraining the sense of the Holy Ghost to our fancy." But, cf. Döllinger's rule for translating in general: "Ideas," not "words," he claims, should be the first aim of the translator. (*The First Age of the Christian Church,* p. xix).

[7] So Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 266, 267.

[8] *General Introduction,* p. 348.

acteristics of the original; in other words, it will lack accuracy. (2) The translators introduced many Latinisms which never became anglicized, and which in turn themselves need to be translated; for example, such expressions and renderings as, "The Syrach owls shall answer, and mermaids in the temples of pleasure" (Isa. 13:22). "Purge the old leaven that you may be a new paste, as you are azymes" (1 Cor. 5:7). "Thou hast fatted my head with oil, and my chalice inebriating how goodie it is" (Ps. 23:5). Also such expressions as Pasch, bread of Proposition, reflourished, assumpted, depositum, and a host of others. The Latin element, and the opposition to the current idiom, contrive to make this version probably the least intelligible of all the English versions to the ordinary reader."[9] (3) There are also occasional interpolations in the text, which are retained without comment.[10] (4) Especially defective is the translation of the Psalter. In many passages the true sense has been lost altogether in passing from the Hebrew into the Greek of the Septuagint, from the Greek of the Septuagint (revised) into the Old Latin, and from the Old Latin (revised) into the English; the resultant rendering in English often becoming so bad as to

[9] So Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions,* p. 307; cf. Milligan, *The English Bible,* p. 102; and *Newth, Lectures on Bible Revision,* p. 34, note.

[10] For example, in 1 Sam. 4:1; 5:6; 10:1; 14:22; 15:12; 17:36; Matt. 7:21, 29, etc.

baffle understanding.[11] In general, it may be said that the language is stiff and the style foreign, rendering it quite unsuited to purposes of devotion.

Different ones have essayed to revise the Rheims-Douay Bible. During the first one hundred and fifty years of its history, however, only two attempts were made, and both of them were private, namely Nary's New Testament of 1718 and Witham's of 1733. The first to take up seriously the responsible work of revision was Bishop Challoner of London in 1750.[12] The language of the original Rheims-Douay Version had grown old, and many of its expressions had become obsolete. Dr. Challoner made thorough work of it. His version, indeed, by Catholics is considered as "little short of a new translation." Cardinal Newman says of it: "At times he adopts the reading of the Authorized Version by preference to those of the Douay Bible . . . His version is even nearer to the Protestant than it is to the Douay; nearer, that is, not in grammatical structure, but in phraseology and diction."[13] His revision of the

[11] For example, Ps. 19:9, "The precept of our Lord lightsome; illuminating the eies"; v. 13, "Sinners who vnderstandeth? from my secrete sinnes cleanse me: and from other mens spare thy seruant." And Ps. 57:10, "Before your thornes did vnderstand the old bryar: as liuing so in wrath he swalloweth them." (Cf. Westcott, *History of the English Bible,* pp. 251, 252.

[12] It is interesting to know that Challoner's parents were both Protestants. Cf. Cotton, *Rheims and Doway,* p. 48; also, the article on "Challoner," by Thompson Cooper in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

[13] Cf. his *Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical,* pp. 414-416; also, Gigot, *General Introduction,* p. 351.

Bible appeared in 1750, and from the first became popular, because he simplified and modernized so successfully the ancient version. Several editions followed in rapid succession, especially of the New Testament in 1752, 1764, 1772, and 1777. The earliest Catholic Bible ever printed in America was that of Dr. Challoner (1790); and to-day not only in America but throughout the English-speaking world, Challoner's Version enjoys the largest circulation of all Roman Catholic versions.

For over thirty years his version held the field. But shortly after his death, a Dublin priest, named Macmahon, published what was virtually a new revision of Challoner's New Testament (1783). In 1791, and again in 1794, he published a new version of the entire Bible; also, two new revisions of the New Testament followed in 1803 and 1810. All these are spoken of as Dr. Troy's Bibles, because of the approbation which he as titular Archbishop of Dublin gave to them.[14] Other editions of the Catholic Bible have appeared since Dr. Troy's, but the changes in the text have been very slight. Cardinal Newman remarks of them: "There have been no material alterations in its text since the revision or re-translation executed by Dr. Challoner . . .

---

[14] Dr. Troy's approbation to the revision of 1791 reads in part as follows: "We approve the new English edition of the Bible . . . which has by our order been carefully collated by the Rev. Bernard Macmahon, with the Clementine Vulgate, also with the Douay Old Testament of 1609 and the Rheims New Testament of 1582, approved English Versions."

so that we are safe in saying, first, that Challoner's revision has been hitherto a final one; next, that there is at present, as regards the Old Testament, one and only one received text, or very nearly so." [15] The only exception of any consequence is the version of Archbishop Kenrick of Philadelphia (1860), in which the bishop followed closely the Vulgate save in the case of the Psalms, concerning which he frankly concedes: "In the Psalms, which came to us through the Septuagint, the Protestant version being made from the Hebrew is preferable." He makes a similar concession in the case of the Prophets and Job.[16]

If it be inquired, which is the standard English Bible Version of the Roman Catholic Church, the answer is that, historically, it is the Rheims-Douay Version of 1582f. as revised by Challoner (1750); but, as a matter of fact, there is no "authorized," or generally approved, standard text. The Council of Trent in 1546 declared the Latin Vulgate to be the standard version of Scripture for all Catholics in all nations, and as such, revised by Clement VIII in 1592, it remains; but no authority in the Roman

---

[15] Gigot confirms this, adding: Bishop Challoner's text "did not undergo any material alterations in the course of the nineteenth century." A recent version of the Gospels by the Very Rev. Francis A. Spencer in 1898, based upon a "consensus of well-known editors, such as Tischendorf, Westcott & Hort, Lachmann, and the translators of the Revised Version," is pronounced by Gigot "in several respects the best translation of the Gospels," (*General Introduction,* p. 355).

[16] Cf. Gigot, *General Introduction,* p. 357.

Catholic Church has ever been exercised in deciding what shall be the accepted version of the Bible in English.[17] Says another Catholic writer: "It is an impression with some that the Douay Bible was approved at Rome; this is an error. Rome does not give any approbation to vernacular versions, the decision as to them in point of orthodoxy, fidelity and purity of language, being left to the bishop in whose diocese the volume appears. . . . We Catholics have actually no standard English Bible." [18] The version in common use to-day is very different from the original Rheims-Douay. "To call it," says Cardinal Wiseman, "any longer the Douay or Rhemish Version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered or modified till scarce any verse remains as it was originally published." [19] In England, Dr. Vaughan's edition is that most commonly in use; in America, the one bearing the *imprimatur* of His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, the late Archbishop of Baltimore, and published with his approbation, by Benziger Brothers, printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

---

[17] Cf. Wright, *Early Bibles of America,* p. 158.

[18] *The Catholic World,* xii, 1871, Art., "English Translations of the Bible."

[19] Cf. *The Dublin Review,* 1836-37, pp. 476-78; O'Callaghan, *American Bibles,* pp. liif.; also T. B. Butler's article on "The Douay Bible," in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* July, 1900, p. 23.

XV

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION

The Catholics published their New Testament, as we have seen, in 1582. Among Protestants at that time there was a growing rivalry between the Bishops' Version, which enjoyed the ecclesiastical sanction of Anglicans, and the Genevan, which was the Bible of the Puritans. The necessity of having but one authorized Protestant translation became more and more apparent. King James favoured the idea, and called an ecclesiastical conference of both parties. In due time, fifty-four (or more probably only forty-seven) representative men, who were well versed in Hebrew and Greek, were appointed to undertake the task, and the enterprise was launched. Among those specially renowned as linguists were Drs. Lively, Spalding and Downes of Cambridge; Drs. Harding, Kilbye, Harmer, Perin, and Miles Smith of Oxford; and Drs. Bedwell, Andrews, Overall, and Saravia of Westminster. "No doubt can be entertained," says Westcott, "as to the ability and acquirements of the revisers." [1]

Fifteen rules were drawn up to govern them in their work; the most important of which were: (1)

[1] *The History of the English Bible*, p. 117.

That they should follow the Bishops' Bible and alter as little as the truth of the originals would permit; (2) that no marginal notes should be affixed except explanations of Hebrew and Greek words; (3) that the work should be done first individually and separately, and then reviewed by all the members of each company meeting together in conference; (4) that special difficulties should be submitted, if deemed necessary, to specialists outside their own number; and (5) that Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, the Great Bible, and the Genevan Versions should be used when they agree better with the original than the Bishops.' How they actually proceeded is not definitely known; but from Dr. Miles Smith's preface to their version we may be sure that they carried out most thoroughly and systematically their instructions. They divided themselves into six companies, two meeting at Cambridge, two at Oxford, and two at Westminster; and the work was apportioned among them. The time spent in the execution of the task was about two and three-fourths years. They are known to have consulted many sources.[2] In their order of words, choice of vocabulary, striking phrases, concise and literal renderings, they were sensibly influenced also by the Rhemish New Testament. Carleton, a Roman Catholic writer, has collected

[2] Namely, the Latin translations of Erasmus (1516) and of Beza (1556); the French version of 1578; the Italian of 1607; the two Spanish of 1569 and 1602; the Latin Old Testament of Tremellius of 1579; as well as all the principal English versions.

long lists of words and expressions which the King James revisers must have borrowed from the Catholic Version, *e.g.*, "malefactor" for "evil-doer" in former versions; "more tolerable" for "easier"; "clemency" for "courtesy"; "use hospitality" for "be ye harborous"; "fragments" for "broken meat"; also, "hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:18); "profane person as Esau" (Heb. 12:16), and a host of others.[3] But the King James Version differs from the Rhemish in seeking to fix an intelligible sense on the words rendered, and in leaving the literal renderings uncoloured by any expository notes.

The faults of the King James Version, though insignificant compared with those of many other versions, are nevertheless not inconspicuous: (1) Its inequalities. In the Old Testament, Job, the Psalms, and some of the Prophets are very defective; in the New Testament, the Epistles, but especially Romans and Corinthians, are poorly done. (2) It contains faulty renderings and occasional interpolations due to the scanty materials at their command. The science of textual criticism was scarcely born in the seventeenth century. Only two of the great MSS. now known to exist were known to them: *Codex Beza* of the Gospels and Acts, and *Codex Claromontanus* of the Epistles. (3) It fails to bring out the different shades of thought in many passages.

---

[3] *The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible,* pp. 27ff.

The Committee's knowledge of the niceties of Greek and Hebrew philology was limited, and so they often failed to catch the full force of a root, an article, a tense, and certain particles in the originals. (4) It sometimes obscures important distinctions through translating two or more words in the original by one in the English. Thus the Greek words for Hades and Gehenna are in English both translated "hell"! (5) On the other hand, it frequently creates distinctions for the sake of variation, when faithfulness to the original required the same word.[4] The principle of avoiding mechanical uniformity is a legitimate one, but it is easily abused.

On the other hand, the merits of the King James Version are especially noteworthy: (1) It is a *revision,* not a new or an arbitrary translation disregardful of its English antecedents. On its title page, it announces itself as "newly translated out of the original tongues, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised." It, therefore, represents a fresh stage in the process of correcting and polishing through which the Protestant Bible has passed. As a revision it is more extensive and thorough than any which hitherto had been undertaken. It was the mature fruit, really, of three generations of practice in translating, and embodies the best elements of all the older versions; being, as

---

[4] For example, the same Greek word, *menein,* is rendered by to abide, remain, continue, tarry, dwell, endure, and be present (cf. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament,* p. 361).

Krauth puts it, "not merely the fruit of their bloom, but the ripeness of their fruit." [5] (2) Its general accuracy. Almost every change which the King James translators introduced was an improvement in the direction of absolute correctness. As Bishop Westcott says: "When every deduction is made for inconsistency of practice and inadequacy of method, the conclusion yet remains absolutely indisputable that their work issued in a version of the Bible better—because more faithful to the original—than any which had been given in English before." [6] (3) It was the product of the ripest scholarship, not of one party but of many parties. It is useless to accuse the King James revisers, as Gigot does, of "wilful perversion," on the ground that their version was openly decried by the Protestant ministers of the time, "as abounding in gross perversions of the original text." [7] The honesty of their translation speaks for itself. (4) Its matchless vocabulary and style, which are "equally admired by friends and opponents." [8] The Committee appropriated happy expressions wherever they found them. Their version, therefore, is a kind of literary mosaic, made up of the best idioms and choicest expressions of previous revisers. Not less than ninety per cent. of its words are said to be Anglo-Saxon. "It combines Saxon

---

[5] *Bible Revision,* p. 33.

[6] *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 288, 289.

[7] *General Introduction,* pp. 366, 367.

[8] Even Gigot, *General Introduction,* p. 365.

strength and Norman grace with Latin majesty." It belongs to the golden age of English literature. It is elevated, venerable, sacred. It reads like poetry. "It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten—like the sound of church bells." [9]

But the original edition of 1611 was poorly edited, and consequently there soon arose variant versions. The folio edition of 1613 is said to have varied from that of 1611 in more than four hundred places.[10] What is especially singular is the fact that though called the "Authorized Version," so far as history knows it was never authorized; and though the Canons and Constitution of the Church in 1631 designated the King James Version as the one with which every parish should be provided, yet two years later these orders were revoked. Still, for over three hundred years it has held its place as "the greatest English classic," and as the universal vernacular of the Protestant Church throughout the English-speaking world. In a word, the so-called "Authorized Version" of 1611 is a monumental literary masterpiece, which, for rhythm and cadence, will ever hold a very high place in the catalogue of Bible revisions.[11]

---

[9] *Dublin Review,* 1853, p. 466.

[10] Cf. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament,* p. 324.

[11] The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States adopted in 1832 the Eyre and Strahan edition. The first printed in America was that of Robert Aitkens, in 1782.

XVI

THE ENGLISH REVISED VERSION

As early as 1646, Dr. Lightfoot, in a sermon before the House of Commons, proposed a fresh "review and survey of the translation of the Bible," and pleaded for "an exact, rigorous and lively translation." Two variant standard copies of the Authorized Version were at that time in circulation; and the Genevan Version was still a rival in the hearts of many. In 1652, and again in 1656, an order for a new revision was introduced into Parliament, but was dropped because of the dissolution of Parliament. Various other futile attempts to secure revision were made during the next century; for example, by Dr. Paris in 1762 and by Dr. Blayney in 1769; but the time was not yet ripe. Finally, in 1870, the Convocation of Canterbury took the initial step of a movement which resulted in producing what is known as the English Revised Version, or more correctly the Anglo-American Version.

Strictly speaking, it was a project launched and carried through to its final consummation by the Church of England, though many celebrated linguists outside that communion were invited to and did assist in its execution. No less than ninety-nine

representative scholars, of whom thirty-four were Americans, had a hand in its accomplishment. Of the sixty-five English scholars on the Committee, forty-one were Anglicans, and twenty-four were from other denominations. Old and New Testament companies were formed in both England and America; those in England meeting in the famous Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey, those in America at the Bible House in New York City.[1] Ten and one-half years were spent on the New Testament; and nearly fifteen on the Old. The rules which governed them were, to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistent with faithfulness; to limit as far as possible the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and Earlier English versions; each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, all changes on the second revision to be ratified by two thirds of those present; the text to be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; variant readings to be indicated in the margin.

The Old Testament Company used the Massoretic

[1] Dr. Browne, Bishop of Winchester, was made chairman of the Old Testament Company; and Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, of the New Testament Company in England; Dr. Philip Schaff was made President of the entire American Committee: Dr. William Henry Green being chairman of the Old Testament Section, and Dr. Woolsey of the New Testament (cf. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament,* pp. 382ff.).

Hebrew text, and the New Testament Company a critical text based upon the newly discovered MSS. The character of their work was most thorough. Though it is usually called a "revision," as far as the New Testament is concerned, it was little less than a new translation, being based upon a text older and in many passages purer than the so-called "Received Text." The Old Testament, too, was greatly stimulated by the more ancient MSS. of the Septuagint Version which had been discovered. For, since the Authorized Version had appeared in 1611, at least four of the chief MSS. of the Bible now known to be still extant, were discovered, namely: the *Codex Alexandrinus,* supposed to date from about 475 A.D. and containing in Greek the whole Bible, was discovered in 1627. It is now in the British Museum; the *Codex Ephraemi* supposed to date from about 450 A.D., containing the entire Bible, also in Greek, was first collated in 1716 and deciphered in 1840. It is now in Paris; the *Codex Sinaiticus,* thought to be as early as 330 A.D., containing both the Old and New Testaments complete, and also the Apocrypha, all in Greek, was discovered by Tischendorf in the Monastery of St. Catherine, at the base of Mt. Sinai, in 1859. It is now in Petrograd; and the *Codex Vaticanus,* dated usually about the middle or in the first half of the fourth century A.D., containing with certain minor omissions the whole of the Old Testament in Greek as well as many of the Apocryphal books, was dis-

covered and published to the world by Tregelles in 1866. It is now in Rome. But it should not be supposed that the new critical text differs widely from that which was known to the King James committee. On the contrary, Westcott and Hort estimate that "the amount of what can in any sense be called variation can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text"; which, indeed, is equivalent to less than two hundred words in the entire New Testament, and in no case seriously affects the substantial correctness of the Holy Scripture." [2]

The principal aim of the entire committee was, without bias or sectarian prejudice, to give to the people an accurate and idiomatic equivalent for the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, on the basis of the idiom and vocabulary of the Authorized Version. The apocryphal books were not included in their original plan. These were nevertheless subsequently revised by a special committee and published in 1895. Whatever defects their version may be found to have, it can never be charged with want of faithfulness. Newth in his *Lectures on Revision* holds that no other version can boast of less theological bias.[3] Removing from the Authorized Version its archaic and obsolescent expressions was in itself a great improvement. For, owing to the natural growth of the English language, more than two hundred words in the Authorized Version had since

---

[2] Cf. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, p. 100.

[3] Cf. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament*, p. 395.

1611 changed in meaning; for example, "let" (Rom. 1:13), "thought" (Matt. 6:25, 27, 31), "damnation" (1 Cor. 11:29), "carriages" (Isa. 10:28; 46:1; Acts 21:15), "prevent" (1 Thess. 4:15), "malice," "conversation," "mortify," "comfort," etc. But the revisers went further: they freed the Authorized Version from many artificial distinctions, and restored certain real distinctions which had been obscured; corrected slight errors, and brought out more vividly the force of an occasional article and verbal form; and in doing so were actuated by one single, sincere motive, namely, to make the new English version as perfect a transcript of the original text as was, humanly speaking, possible.

That they succeeded in part only was entirely to be expected. Their age was an especially critical one, and their individual though unconscious bias was naturally critical. Moreover, the Authorized Version which they assayed to better, and perfect, and improve upon, was exceedingly precious to many a believer's heart—almost sacrosanct! Its language, indeed, had become a part of its message. To all such, the revisers had in many, very many, cases ruthlessly, it seemed, altered passages which were perfectly correct, as well as religiously dear, and had substituted a verbiage which lacked both in idiom and rhythm. Of the thirty-six thousand changes in the New Testament alone many appear to be changes for the sake of change; in fact, purely arbitrary. Hence, their work was not appreciated. Nearly fifty

years have now passed and still this new English Version is valued chiefly by scholars, and is anything but popular with the common people. Yet, it was intended to be a translation especially adapted to ordinary readers. Time has shown that its improved grammatical accuracy is not a sufficient compensation for the music of the old cadences, which in so many cases has been sacrificed for some trifling point in syntax! "Two-thirds" majorities decided many of the changes that were made by the Committee, but to-day the reading public are deciding that the English Version can never displace the Authorized. From time to time, also, scholars are demonstrating that in certain instances it is even less true to the originals than the old version, and less exact in its exegesis.[4]

[4] Cf. especially an article by Rev. J. B. McClellan, entitled, "The Revised Version of the New Testament: A Plea for Hesitation as to its Adoption," in *The Expositor,* 1904, pp. 187-202.

XVII

THE AMERICAN STANDARD REVISION

The last, the most important, and in many particulars the best English Version is that known as "The American Standard Revision," published by Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1900-01. It is a fresh recension of the English or Anglo-American Revision of 1881-85. It continues, completes, and in many instances corrects the work undertaken by the Church of England in 1870. And therefore, in a very true sense, it is essentially and historically the product of both English and American scholarship. In short it is the result of thirty years of active and almost ceaseless labour on the part of many of the most scholarly and capable men in the Protestant world.

As the American revisers tell us in their preface, "The American Revision Committee, after the publication of the Revised Version in 1885, resolved to continue their organization, and have regarded it as a possibility that an American recension of the English Version might eventually be called for. Accordingly, they have been engaged more or less diligently

ever since 1885, and especially in the last four years, in making ready for such publication." [1] The New Testament revisers had already said: "The New Testament Company have not felt at liberty to make new changes of moment which were not favourably passed upon by their associates at one stage or another of the original preparation of the work." [2]

When the copyright was given to the University presses of Oxford and Cambridge, it had been stipulated that for fourteen years the English Revision as published by them, should contain in an appendix the preferred American readings; and it was promised by the American Committee that they, on their part, would sanction no other version during that period. The contract expired in 1899. Meanwhile, it became evident to the American Committee that even their preferred readings (which had been hastily thrown together almost at the last minute prior to the publication of the English Revision in 1885) were regarded with sympathetic favour on all sides, and in some cases by the English themselves. They also saw that they could improve in some particulars their own hastily prepared list, through addition and correction. Accordingly, they were encouraged to go forward. They not only revised their own readings of 1885, but added other new ones, and, being free (as the Anglo-American Committee of 1881-85 were not) they also revised the

[1] *Preface to the Old Testament,* 1901, p. iii.

[2] *Idem,* 1900. p. iii.

titles and headings of the various books of the New Testament.[3]

As a whole, it must be acknowledged that their emendations and changes show the touch of master workmen. One of the foremost English authorities says of the American Revision, "that many improvements have been made upon the revision of 1885, none would wish to deny." [4] They laboured with the conviction that every jot and tittle of God's Word is important. To them the preciousness of the volume enhanced greatly the importance and responsibility of the task. And so they kept on for fourteen additional years, perfecting and polishing what their predecessors had bequeathed, and made many excellent changes in the direction of a more perfect replica of the original revelation of God!

Thus, (1) for the first time in the history of the English Bible, the sacred name of "Jehovah" is given uniformly as the equivalent of the Hebrew name wherever it occurs in the Old Testament. To do so was for the American Revisers a risky adventure. Only one other vernacular version of Holy

---

[3] For example, the prefix "Saint" to the names of several New Testament writers is dropped, because there is no evidence that this title was originally used (cf. their *Preface to the New Testament,* p. iv). Moreover, the title "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews" as in the English Revised Version is revised to read, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," on the basis of more ancient MS. authority.

[4] J. H. Lupton, Art., "English Versions," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* Extra Volume, 1904, p. 271; cf. D. G. Wylie's *American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible in Pulpit and Pew,* 1903.

Scripture in all Europe (a Spanish Protestant) had ever ventured to set forth this Divine Name in a similar fashion. All other English Versions, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, had arbitrarily substituted for the Hebrew tetragrammaton, JHVH, either LORD (spelled with four capitals), or God, thus following the Jews in reading the vowels instead of the consonants of the form in the Hebrew original.[5] But "Jehovah" was the personal name of the national God of Israel, signifying that he was Israel's Redeemer, Saviour, self-existent and covenant-keeping God; hence this very characteristic, and all-important Sacred Divine name of Deity ought no more to be obscured in any translation of the Old Testament than "Jesus" in the New.[6]

(2) Correspondingly, in the New Testament, the American revisers are the first to use uniformly

---

[5] Even in the classic passage, Exod. 6:3, the Douay Version reads, "And my name *Adonai* I did not shew them"; but in substituting *Adonai* for the name of Israel's national God, the chief point of the passage is missed. Cf. Amos 8:11; 9:5, in which even the English Revised Version follows the Jewish practice of reading the vowels instead of the consonants!

[6] The fact that the pronunciation Jehovah, as the equivalent in English of the tetragrammaton JHVH is a mongrel form, which has arisen from uniting the vowels of Adonai with the consonants of the sacred name, JHVH and that this union of the vowels of one word with the consonants of another, cannot be traced back to a date earlier than 1518 A.D., when Petrus Galatinus, confessor of Leo X proposed to read them together, is no objection to our making the Divine Name of the Hebrews appear in English wherever it appears in the original of the Old Testament. Dr. G. F. Moore traces its use back to 1278 A.D. (cf. *Old Testament and Semitic Studies,* in the W. R. Harper Memorial Volumes, Vol. I, p. 147).

"Holy Spirit" for "Holy Ghost," the intrinsic merit of which far outweighs the objection raised by Lupton that the latter "has become so deeply embedded in the creeds and formularies of the Church that it would be difficult to displace it." [7] No real improvement in any translation is too "difficult" to make! The Anglo-American Revision of 1881 had already made the change in certain cases.

(3) "Sheol" in the Old Testament and "Hades" in the New are used instead of "hell," "pit," and "the grave," when the abode of the dead is intended. This is a vast improvement upon the former translations, and might well be extended to the use of "hell" in the Apostles' Creed. Whether these foreign words will speedily become naturalized one may reasonably doubt, but we have already assimilated, directly or indirectly, from the Hebrew such words as Sabbath, manna, Satan, behemoth, Sabaoth, cherub, Nazarite, shekel, and many others, and why may we not also assimilate these, in the course of time? The principle of introducing a loan word when the English has no proper equivalent is a sound and well-established one.[8]

(4) The American revisers are to be commended for their use of euphemisms, to avoid words or ex-

---

[7] Art., "English Versions," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, extra volume, p. 269.

[8] The English revisers introduce "Sheol" twenty-nine times out of sixty-four where it occurs in the original; why not use this anglicized term as the equivalent of the Hebrew word in every case?

pressions which have become in time somewhat indelicate to the modern ear: for example, "Lord, by this time the body *decayeth*" (John 11:39); "And faithfulness the girdle of his *loins*" (instead of, to many, the meaningless "reins," Isa. 11:5); ""Yea, my *heart* instructeth me in the night seasons" (Ps. 16:7); "If I leave of all that pertain to him by the morning light so much as *one man-child*" (1 Sam. 25:22); "To eat their own dung, and to drink their own *water,* with you?" (2 Kings 18:27); "My *anguish,* my *anguish!* I am pained at my very heart" (Jer. 4:19).

(5) In many passages the American Standard Edition brings out more accurately than any other in the English language the true meaning of the original writers. This can easily be demonstrated: thus, in Acts 17:22, Paul preaching in the Areopagus begins, "Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are very religious" not as in the Rheims, the Authorized, and the English Versions, "ye are very superstitious"; for the Greek does not require it, and it is perfectly obvious that the great Apostle would not begin his sermon to the educated and cultured audience of Athens with an insult! Or, take Phil. 2:6, "Who existing in the form of God counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped," which is far better than "Who being in the form of God thought it not *robbery* to be equal with God," of the Authorized and Rheims versions. Or, to take one other example, Rom. 5:1, "Being

therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God"; not, *"let us have peace* with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," as the Rheims and English versions; for, as the revisers in King James' time already saw, the latter vitiates the apostle's argument and introduces a serious error of doctrine. Reconciliation as an effect of justification is not a matter of exhortation but of declaration![9]

Taken as a whole, the American Standard Revision is, in our judgment, the most faithful, the most accurate, and the most truly idiomatic version of Holy Scripture ever made in English for popular use. It brings the reader more closely into contact with the exact thought of the sacred writers than any other. Its excellencies are manifold. In spelling, punctuation and grammar, in paragraph divisions, titles, marginal references and parallel passages, in headings, chapter and verse divisions, in the elimination of Hebraisms and archaisms, and especially in its conformity to the originals, and in general accuracy, it is the acme of Protestant endeavour, and a praiseworthy monument of what generations of Bible study, investigation, and sympathetic love for the oracles of God can accomplish. In short, it is simple in language, chaste, idiomatic, rhythmical, stately, scholarly, loyal to the truth, and in every sense, a living book. In it the eternal truth of God

[9] Cf. McClellan, *Expositor,* September, 1904, p. 190. For other passages more accurately rendered in the American Version, see Eccl. 12:5; Heb. 11:1; Isa. 53:8; 2 Cor. 12:9; Gen. 41:38 and Exod. 31:3.

has been reclothed in garments which are new, and yet, which express with verity and fidelity the language of Canaan. Thus, through thirty years of refinement and polishing, the column of truth which the early translators hewed out of the Hebrew and Greek quarries, has become, under the hands of American craftsmen, strong and beautiful; polished, indeed, "after the similitude of a palace"!

Thus,

"The sacred Book,
In dusty sequestration wrapt too long,
Assumes the accents of our native tongue:
And he who guides the plough, or wields the crook,
With understanding spirit now may look
Upon her records, listen to her song,
And sift her laws."

During recent years several other individual translations have appeared, chief among which are *The Twentieth Century New Testament* (1898); Weymouth's *New Testament* (1902); Moffatt's *New Testament* (1913); Darby's *The Old and New Testaments* (1920); Goodspeed's *American Translation of the New Testament* (1923); Ballantine's *The Riverside New Testament* (1923); Helen Barrett Montgomery's *Centenary Translation of the New Testament* (1924); Moffatt's *New Translation of the Old Testament* (1924); and, *The Old Testament, an American Translation,* edited by J. M. Powis Smith—all excellent, if used

as commentaries on the Bible, and to be commended.[10]

As we conclude the history of our English Bible, it becomes evident how very slow the process of its development has been; always, however, progressive!

"Slowly the Bible of the race is writ,
And not on paper leaves nor leaves of stone;
Each age, each kindred adds to it,
Texts of despair, or hope, or joy, or moan.
While swings the sea, while mists the mountains shroud,
While thunder's surges burst, on cliffs of cloud,
Still at the prophet's feet the nations sit."

---

[10] Two other English Versions need to be mentioned: the first is that published by the Oxford and Cambridge presses in 1899, just as "the fourteen years" expired, during which the American Committee were under bonds to the English presses not to issue or sanction any other Version than the English Revision of 1885. The preferred readings of the American Section of the Committee in 1881-85, were injected into the text and given out as "the American Version"; done of course to capture the American market! This version is known as the Pseudo-American Revision. The other is what is known as the Tercentenary Edition of the Authorized Version, edited specially by Dr. C. I. Scofield, and published by the Oxford University Press in 1911. It was beautifully printed; but being very superficially revised, it fell dead from the press!

XVIII

FOOTNOTES AND MARGINAL REFERENCES

Wycliffe (1382) and his reviser, Purvey (1388), were the first to introduce short comments in the margin of their Bibles, and Protestants followed their example.

Tyndale (1525) added to his translation, unfortunately, many bitterly controversial notes; notes born, however, of the peculiar circumstances of his time. For example, on Gen. 24:60, "And they blessed Rebecca," Tyndale comments: "To bless a man's neighbour is to pray for him and to wish him good: and not to wag two fingers over him" (alluding to the papal benediction).[1] On the other hand, in his revised editions of Genesis and of the New Testament he substituted an entirely new set of comments which were wholly of a hortatory and explanatory character. His prologues to the different books of the Bible are exceptionally beautiful and suggestive.

Coverdale (1535) greatly reduced the number of

[1] For others of a similar character, see those on Exod. 32:32; Num. 16:15; 23:8; Deut. 11:19 (cf. Milligan, *The English Bible*, pp. 35, 36).

notes and annotations in his edition of the Bible. He retained from Tyndale's, from Luther's, and from the Zürich Bible, only sixty-six altogether, of which forty-seven were added to the Old Testament and nineteen to the New, and all of them chiefly explanatory. Each book Coverdale accompanied by a summary of its contents, arranged according to chapters. The Apocrypha has a separate preface.[2]

In Matthew's Bible (1537), the notes are the most original and characteristic feature of the version. In character, they are both explanatory and polemic. For example, Matt. 5:12 is annotated: "reward is given to men for their work, but it is not due to their work." [3] Certain of them so provoked the Catholic bishops, that it was thought best to omit them from the Matthews' Bible of 1540. This version also had headings to each chapter; and was the first to have a "table of principal matters contained in the Bible," from which sprang the first English Concordance!

The Great Bible (1539) incorporated *in the text* variant readings, printing them in parentheses with a difference of type. For example, Josh. 2:11 is commented upon and printed thus: "As we heard

---

[2] Special attention should be given to the comments by Coverdale on Gen. 3:6; 17:2; 41:45; Exod. 17:16; 2 Kings 25:6; Matt. 1:8; 26:7; Mk. 3:21 (cf. Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions,* p. 169).

[3] For others, see those attached to John 6:33; Mark 1:27; Matt. 9:2; 16:18; 25:9; 2 Macc. 12:44 (cf. Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 72, 177f; Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions,* pp. 189ff; and Milligan, *The English Bible,* pp. 61, 62.

these things (*we were sore afraid and*) our hearts did faint"; and Col. 3:25, thus: "Neither is there any respect of persons (*with God*)." [4] A "pointing hand" ☞ was used to call attention to "certain godly annotations," which Coverdale had intended to add at the end of the volume to explain "the dark places of the text," but he never found time to do so; consequently the Great Bible appeared without these notes.

Whittingham's New Testament (1557) and the Genevan Version (1560) contained numerous annotations, many of which are strongly Calvinistic. Some are bitterly anti-papal, but the great majority are simply hortatory and explanatory. Two will suffice to illustrate their double nature; thus, the note to Rom. 9:15 reads: "As the will or purpose of God is the chief cause of election and reprobation, so his free mercy in Christ is an inferior cause of salvation, and the hardening of the heart an inferior cause of damnation"! That appended to Rev. 9:3 reads: "Locusts are false teachers, heretics and worldly subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, doctors, bachelors and masters, which forsake Christ to maintain false doctrine." [5] To the strictly canonical books, the marginal notes constitute little less than a

[4] Cf. Newth, *Lectures on Revisions,* p. 22.

[5] Cf. Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 93-96, 238-240; Newth, *Lectures on Revision,* p. 30; Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions,* p. 259; and Milligan, *The English Bible,* p. 96.

running commentary. Nothing was left, they say, "unexpounded whereby he that is anything exercised in the Scriptures of God might justly complain of hardness." Only a very few notes were affixed to the Apocrypha.

The Bishops' Bible (1568) aimed, professedly, "to make no bitter notes upon any text, or yet to set down any determination in places of controversy." Accordingly, it has fewer annotations than the Genevan Version; and in the majority of cases, they are simply alternative readings. Those of a doctrinal character are clearly borrowed from the Genevan. For example, the theological tone of the note to Phil. 2:12 is Calvinistic: "Our health hangeth not on our works, and yet they are said to work out their health who do run in the race of justice. For although we be saved freely in Christ by faith, yet must we walk by the way of justice unto our health." [6]

The Rheims-Douay Bible (1582, 1609-10), carried numerous annotations; about one sixth of the whole consisting of annotations and explanatory notes. They were inserted in the original text "to help the faithful reader in the difficulties of divers places." [7] In 1850 these annotations were thoroughly revised by Bishop Challoner, and are consequently

---

[6] For other illustrations, see Westcott, *The History of the English Bible,* pp. 254, 255; Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions,* pp. 282, 283; Milligan, *The English Bible,* p. 96.

[7] So the translators state in their Preface to the *Rhemish New Testament,* of 1582.

spoken of frequently as "Challoner's Notes." They may be classified as follows:

(1) Those which are intended to be simply explanatory. Many of this class are excellent; some possessing even critical value. Thus to Luke 14:26, "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children," etc., is appended the footnote: "The law of Christ does not allow us to hate even our enemies, much less our parents; but the meaning of the text is that we must be in that disposition of soul as to be willing to renounce and part with everything how near and dear soever it may be to us, that would keep us from following Christ." [8]

(2) Those which are obscure, far-fetched, or of doubtful accuracy, and which, therefore, would better be omitted. For example, to Ps. 135:1, 2, 3, which exhorts the reader to "Praise the Lord for he is good," there is attached this annotation, "By this invitation to praise the Lord, thrice repeated, we profess the Blessed Trinity, one God in three distinct Persons, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." [9]

(3) Those based upon obscure or incorrect translations and which, therefore, would naturally fall away as soon as the version is duly revised.

---

[8] For other explanatory notes, see those attached to Rom. 8:29; 9:11; James 1:2; 2:10; Isa. 45:7; 1 Kings 15:9; 2 Kings 10:18.

[9] For similar far-fetched explanations, see those appended to John 6:54; Num. 17:8; Judges 16:30; Job 39:34; 1 Kings 12-11; 31:1; Pss. 54:16, 108:6; 71:20; Zech. 1:8, and frequently in Canticles.

Thus, Ps. 90:9: "For all our days are spent: and in thy wrath we have fainted away. Our years shall be consumed as a spider"; to which is added the illuminating comment: "As frail and weak as a spider's web; and miserable withal, whilst like a spider we spend our bowels in weaving webs to catch flies"! [10]

(4) Those which are doctrinally biased and apologetic, and which are obviously intended to serve as a guard to Catholic dogma. Thus, Matt. 12:31, 32: "But the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven . . . neither in this world nor in the world to come"; to which is attached this apologetic footnote: "From these words, St. Augustine and St. Gregory gather that some sins may be remitted in the world to come, and consequently that there is a purgatory or a middle place." [11]

(5) Those which are intolerant and controversial and which are bound to perpetuate the bitterness of a former age. Even Geddes, himself a Catholic, speaks of them as in many cases "virulent and manifestly calculated to support a system, not of genuine Catholicity, but of Transalpine Popery." [12]

---

[10] For others quite as ludicrous, compare especially those to Hebrews 11:21; Gen. 47:31; Acts 16:16; Job 21:33; Ps. 20:13; 31:4; 48:6; 105:33; Isa. 28:20; Prov. 30:1; Zech. 9:17.

[11] Cf. further those to Matt. 13:55; 1:25; 16:18, 19; 26:26, 27; 28:18-20; Luke 17:10; 23:43; John 5:39; 20:19, 23; 21:17; Acts 8:17; Rom. 4:2, 3, 4, 7, 8; 7:5; 11:6, and many others—all intended to bind the reader to one particular interpretation, and so to guard the dogmas of the Church.

[12] Quoted by Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible*, p. 209.

Of this sort there are far too many; thus, to Luke 1:48, which reads, "For behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed," is added the note: "These words are a prediction of that honour which the church in all ages should pay to the Blessed Virgin. Let Protestants examine whether they in any way are concerned in this prophecy." And to Num. 16:2, which relates how Korah and his company "rose up against Moses," and were swallowed up, is attached this comforting annotation: "The crime of these men which were punished in so remarkable a manner was that of schism and of rebellion against the authority established by God in the church; and their pretending to the priesthood without being lawfully called and sent; the same is the case of all modern sectaries."[13]

In addition to all these annotations, in the Roman Catholic Bible, each book of Scripture is prefaced by a heading, containing also a summary, in which useful information is given concerning the authorship, contents, argument, and period covered by the book in hand. There are also chapter headings and references to parallel passages which are in many cases instructive and helpful; frequent, also, are "chronological dates," which, however, sadly need

---

[13] For others of like character, see the notes attached to Phil. 2:12; 2 Cor. 1:19; Isa. 2:18; 2 Thess. 2:3; Pss. 98:6; 104:45; 1 John 2:27; 4:1; John 15:26; Rom. 10:15; 11:20; Matt. 18:20; Gen. 1:28; Lev. 17:3; Jude 17; Rev. 9:1:3; Heb. 6:4. It is noteworthy, however, that Galatians "the Epistle of Protestantism" is altogether free of all annotations of this tone.

revision in the light of modern discovery.[14] The chapter and verse divisions, for the most part, correspond with those of the Protestant Bible; the Psalms and Job having the greatest deflection from the Protestant reckoning. Thus, the Douay Version unites, in one, Pss. 9 and 10 of the Hebrew and Protestant Psalters, and numbers them when thus united as "Psalm 9," with double versification; *i.e.*, there are then in the Psalm two verses numbered "one," two numbered "three," etc. Psalms 114 and 115 are also made into one and numbered Ps. 113; also with double versification; but Psalms 116 and 147 are each divided into two separate Psalms, so that in the final count the total, one hundred and fifty, remains the same.[15]

The King James Version (1611) rightly excluded all notes of a theological or controversial character. And, with the single exception of an edition in 1649, in which the Genevan notes were revived, Protestants have ever since eliminated all notes which would give offence to Catholic readers.[16] But alternate readings

---

[14] For example, it is assumed that the world was created 4004 B.C., that Cain was born 4002, Seth 3874, and Noah 2948; that the flood took place 2468, that the Tower of Babel was built 2204, and that Abram migrated from Haran, 1921 B.C., etc.

[15] In the Douay Bible, Job 40 begins at chap. 40:6 of the Protestant Version.

[16] Dr. Miles Smith's famous Preface to the "Authorized Version," however, is unfortunately marred by two sinister thrusts: one, at the "scrupulosity of the Puritan," and the other, at the "obscurity of the Papists." (cf. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament*, p. 361).

of Hebrew and Greek words (to the number of seven thousand, it is said) and "references" intended to facilitate the study of the Bible through comparison of one passage with another (to the number of over nine thousand), and certain explanations of distances, weights, and measures, besides page and chapter headings, and also *italics* to mark words not directly represented in the original, were added to the original King James Version.[17] The "chronological dates" were not introduced, in the original version of 1611, but were supplied by Bishop Lloyd in 1701, having been taken substantially from Archbishop Ussher's *Annals* (1650-54).

The English, or Anglo-American Revision (1881-85), when first published, allowed the marginal references of the "Authorized Version" temporarily to disappear, but in recent editions of the same version they have been revised and published. The *alternative* readings of the ancient authorities are very numerous in this version; indeed, so numerous that they are apt to confuse the ordinary reader. They are nevertheless of great value to scholars; their chief fault being a lack of definiteness.[18]

The American Standard Edition (1901) rejected

---

[17] *Italics,* however, are of doubtful value; for, as Milligan points out, "if the words italicized do no more than represent the sense of the original, there is no reason for specially distinguishing them; while, if they go beyond that, they are of the nature of a gloss or explanation, and have no right to be there at all." (*The English Bible,* p. 116).

[18] Cf. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* p. 269.

about five sixths of the alternative readings of the English Version; doing so on the basis of the conviction that it is impossible to correct the Hebrew text by means of the ancient versions.[19] They were careful, however, in the case of those retained "to designate which of the ancient versions contain a specified reading, instead of making the vague, oft-repeated, and oft-inaccurate, statement, that "some ancient versions" or "many ancient versions," read, so and so! Marginal references, and topical "page headings" have also been added, to facilitate the use of the version; the greatest care being taken in the preparation of these to avoid everything of doubtful exegesis. These headlines and the references to parallel and illustrative biblical passages constitute the two most obvious departures of the American edition from the English Revision. In the New Testament Epistles particularly, the new and original device of leaving a space blank, to indicate the more outstanding translations from one topic to another, together with the improved paragraphing of the translation as the whole, render this edition all that can be desired. Happily, no uncertain chronological dates, or controversial annotations mar this version, the bare text being allowed to speak for itself.

---

[19] Cf. their *Preface to the Old Testament,* p. vii.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE
SELECTED LITERATURE

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Between	250–150 B.C	The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament.
"	150–200 A.D.	The Peshitto, or Syriac Version.
"	390–405 "	The Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome.
"	300–500 "	The Sinai Palimpsest in Syriac.
"	300–350 "	The Codex Vaticanus.
"	330–340 "	The Codex Sinaiticus.
"	450–500 "	The Codex Alexandrinus.
"	400–500 "	The Codex Ephraemi.
"	500–600 "	The Codex Beza and the Codex Claromontanus.
"	700–725 "	The Codex Amiatinus.
"	700–1000 "	Anglo Saxon Beginnings.
"	1100–1350 "	Old English Translations.
Ca.	1382	Wycliffe's Translation.
	1388	Purvey's Revision of Wycliffe's.
	1525	Tynsdale's New Testament.

1535	Coverdale's Bible.
1537	Matthew's Revision of Tyndale's New Testament.
1539	The Great Bible; Tavener's also.
1557	Whittingham's New Testament.
1560	The Genevan Version.
1568	The Bishops' Bible.
1582	The Rheims New Testament.
1592	The Clementine Edition of the Vulgate.
1609–10	The Douay Old Testament.
1611	The Authorized Version.
1750	Challoner's Revision of the Rheims–Douay Version.
1881–85	The English, or Anglo-American Revision.
1899	The "Pseudo" American Revised Edition.
1900–01	The American Revised Version, Standard Edition.
1900–01	The Tercentenary Edition of the Authorized Version.

SELECTED LITERATURE

B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament,* 5th edit.; *The Bible in the Church, A Popular Account of the Collection and Reception of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Churches* (1901); also *A General View of the History of the English Bible,* 2nd edit. The Macmillan Company., 1872.

W. H. Green, *General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon,* 1898; *The Text,* 1899; Charles Scribner's Sons.

H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament,* Macmillan Co., 1892.

F. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament,* translated by John MacPherson, T. & T. Clark, 1892.

G. Wildeboer, *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament,* translated by B. W. Bacon, Luzac & Co., 1895.

C. A. Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scripture,* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,* 2nd edit., A. & C. Black, 1895.

A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Divine Library of the Old Testament,* Macmillan Co., 1892.

E. C. Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church,* Macmillan Co., 1904.

G. Salmon, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament,* E. & J. B. Young & Co.

H. B. Hunting, *The Story of Our Bible, How It Grew to Be What It Is,* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.

M. Dods, *The Bible, Its Origin and Nature,* Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

A. S. Zerbe, *The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature,* Central Publishing House, Cleveland, 1911

A. S. Peake, *The Bible, Its Origin, Its Significance, and Its Abiding Worth,* 5th edit., Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.

E. G. Goodspeed, *The Story of the New Testament* (1916); and *The Making of the English New Testament,* University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Kirsopp Lake, *The Text of the New Testament,* Rivington, 1916.

F. G. Lewis, *How the Bible Grew,* University of Chicago Press, 1919.

Max L. Margolis, *The Story of Bible Translations,* The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1917.

E. W. Rice, *Our Sixty-six Sacred Books; or, How Our Bible was Made,* American Sunday School Union, 1902.

W. F. Lofthouse, *The Bible, Its Origin and Authority,* Eaton and Mains, 1916.

S. M. Vernon, *The Making of the Bible,* Abingdon Press, 1916.

J. Paterson Smyth, *How We Got Our Bible,* 1899; *The Old Documents and the New Bible,* 1890; *The Bible in the Making,* 1921, James Pott & Co.

A. Harnack, *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments,* Hinrich, 1914; and *Bible Reading in the Early Church,* Putnam's, 1912.

J. A. Bewer, *The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development.* Columbia Univ. Press, 1923.

C. H. Moehlman, *The Unknown Bible,* Doran Co., 1926.

I. M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible,* The Sunday School Times Co., 1907.

A. H. Charteris, *The New Testament Scriptures, Their Claims, History, and Authority,* R. Carter and Bros., 1882.

M. W. Jacobus (editor), *Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared* (The Gould Prize Essays), Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

H. W. Hoare, *The Evolution of the English Bible,* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1902.

F. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1903.

J. Eadie, *The English Bible,* 2 vols., Macmillan Co., 1876.

G. Milligan, *The English Bible, A Sketch of its History,* A. & C. Black, 1896.

J. Stoughton, *Our English Bible, Its Translations and Translators,* The Religious Tract Society, 1878.

W. F. Moulton, *The History of the English Bible,* Charles H. Kelly, 1887.

P. Schaff, *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version,* 4th edit., Harper & Brothers, 1899.

S. Newth, *Lectures on Bible Revision,* Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.

J. I. Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions of the Bible,* 2nd edit., D. Appleton & Co., 1890.

J. G. Carleton, *The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible,* Clarendon Press, 1902.

H. C. Cotton, *Rhemes and Doway,* Oxford University Press, 1855.

J. Wright, *Early Bibles of America,* 3rd edit., Thomas Whittaker, 1894.

J. W. Beardslee, *The Bible Among the Nations; A Study of the Great Translations,* Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899.

A. B. Davidson, *Biblical and Literary Essays* (chap. vii), A. C. Armstrong, 1902.

J. R. Doré, *Old Bibles, An Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible,* 2nd edit., Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888.

E. B. O'Callaghan, *A History of Editions of the Holy Scripture and Parts Thereof. Printed in America Previous to* 1860. Munsell and Rowland, 1861.

J. Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible Into English, both in MSS. and in Print,* W. Baynes, 1818.

S. R. Tregelles, *The English Hexapla with an Account of the Principal English Translations,* Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1891.

B. Condit, *The History of the English Bible,* 2nd edit., A. S. Barnes & Co., 1896.

H. C. Conant, *The Popular History of the Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue,* J. K. Funk & Co., 1881.

Anglo-American Bible Revision, by members of the American Revision Committee, American Sunday School Union, 1879.

S. R. Driver, *The Parallel Psalter, with Introduction and Glossaries,* Clarendon Press, 1898.

D. G. Wylie, *The American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible in Pulpit and Pew,* 1903.

C. W. E. Body, *Companion to the Marginal Readings of the Bible,* Thos. Nelson & Sons, 1904.

Prefaces to the English Versions, 1881-85; and to the *American Revised Version,* 1901.

J. H. Blunt, *A Key to the Knowledge and Use of the Holy Bible,* Rivington's, 1877.

Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Parts I-IV, 1903.

E. C. Bissell, *The Historic Origin of the Bible,* A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1873; *The Apocrypha*

of the Old Testament, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880.

W. Fulke, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scripture into the English Tongue Against the Cavils of Gregory Martin,* University Press, Cambridge, 1843.

C. J. Ellicott, *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture,* Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1901.

C. B. McAfee, *The Greatest English Classic,* Harper & Brothers, 1912.

A. S. Cook, *The Authorized Version of the Bible and Its Influence,* Putnam's Sons, 1910.

H. J. White, Art. "Vulgate," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* IV, 1902.

F. C. Burkett, Art., "Text and Versions," *Encyclopedia Biblica,* IV, 1903.

B. F. Westcott, Art., "Vulgate," Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible,* IV, 1890.

K. Budde, and J. A. Robinson, Art., "Canon," *Encyclopedia Biblica,* I, 1899.

A. Stewart, Art., "Bible," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* I, 1898.

J. H. Lupton, Art., "English Versions," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (*Extra volume*), 1904.

J. B. McClellan, Art., "The Revised Version of the New Testament; A Plea for Hesitation as to its Adoption." *Expositor,* London, 1904.

H. M. Whitney, Art., "The Latest Translation of the Bible," *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1902.

H. P. Smith, Art., "The Value of the Vulgate Old Testament for Textual Criticism," *Presbyterian and Reformed Review,* 1891.

I. Abrahams, Art., "The Revised Version of the Apocrypha," *Jewish Quarterly Review,* viii, 1895-96.

E. H. Plumptre, Art., "Authorized Version," Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible,* IV, 1890.

F. W. Farrar, "Fidelity and Bias in Versions of the Bible," *Expositor,* 1882.

Roman Catholic Authorities

F. E. Gigot, *General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures,* 3rd edit., Benziger Bros., 1903.

J. J. Döllinger, *The First Age of Christianity and the Church;* translated by H. N. Oxenham, 2 vols., 3rd edit., Wm. H. Allen & Co., 1877.

Cardinal Newman, *Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical,* Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.

Prefaces to the Rheims-Douay Bible, 1582, 1609-10, and 1899, Benziger Brothers.

Thos. Ward, *Errata of the Protestant Bible, or the Truth of the English Translations Examined,* P. J. Kennedy, Publisher to the Holy Apostolic See, 1st edit., 1680-88; new and revised edit., 1903.

F. Kaulen, *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift, Alten u. Neuen Testaments,* 3rd edit., 1890.

J. G. Shea, *A Bibliographical Account of Catholic Bibles,* Cramoisy Press, 1859.

A. E. Breen, *A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture,* New York, 1897.
F. A. Gasquet, *The Old English Bible and Other Essays,* John C. Nimmo, London, 1897.
C. Chauvin, *Leçons d'Introduction Générale aux Divine Ecritures,* Paris, 1897.
Abbé A. Loisy, *Histoire du Canon de l'Ancient Testament,* 1890; *Histoire du Canon de l'Nouveau Testament,* Paris, 1891.
S. F. Smith, Articles, "Our English Catholic Bible" *The Month,* June and July, 1897.
An Anonymous Writer, Art., "English Translations of the Bible," *The Catholic World,* XII, 1871.
Cardinal Wiseman, Art., "A New Version of the Four Gospels with Notes Critical and Explanatory," *Dublin Review,* ii, 1836-37.
Thos. J. Butler, Art., "The Douay Bible," *Irish Ecclesiastical Review,* July, 1900.
Abbé F. Vigouroux, Art., "Canon des Ecritures," *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* ii, 1899.
F. Kaulen, Art., "Vulgata," XII, *Kirchenlexikon,* 1903.
O. Schmid, Art., "Bibellesen der Laien," II, *Kirchenlexikon,* 1883.

Books which lay bare the relation and attitude of the Christian of today toward his church.

THEY THAT HUNGER AND THIRST

REV. GEORGE A. MILLER, D.D.

A positive affirmation of the reality of the life of the Spirit $2.00

THE MAKING OF THE CHRISTIAN MIND

GAIUS GLENN ATKINS

A contour history of the development of the Christian mind in action through the centuries from Jesus until today. Religious philosophy in straightforward, readable style. $3.00

THE PARABLES OF JESUS

GEORGE A. BUTTRICK, D.D.

The sayings of Jesus in all their strength and simplicity. Dr. Buttrick has cut right through the accumulation of centuries of theology and reveals the immensity of the truths Jesus gave to men. $2.50

THE IMPATIENCE OF A PARSON

H. R. L. SHEPPARD, C.H., D.D.

"Gathers up and utters the profound discontent felt everywhere with religion as it is now. . ." $2.00

THE HERESY OF ANTIOCH

ROBERT NORWOOD

Paul, our contemporary, aflame with love and zeal for Jesus Christ. The best book on Paul since Glover's "Paul of Tarsus." $2.50

DOUBLEDAY DORAN RELIGIOUS BOOKS